The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:

REV. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D.
REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
DR. WILL G. MOORE, M.A.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.
REV. LESLIE J. TIZARD, B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 35 Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XXII. No. 3. **JULY, 1944**

CONTENTS

(Continued from cover)

PAGE

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—

HOW A UNION WORKS—A WARNING FROM METHODISM - - - - A. E. HARPER 262

A WARLESS WORLD - - - - - - JOHN DAVIES 267

ON LIFE AND BOOKS—

CRICKET NOTES - - - - - - - ALBERT PEEL 271

CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Dr. R. S. FRANKS, and Mr. SYDNEY H. MOORE, M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - 274

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR, the Revs. G. F. NUTTALL, M.A., B.D., L. J. TIZARD, B.A., B.D., B.Litt., A. T. S JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., K. G. OGILVIE, M.A., Mr. W. R. NIBLETT, B.A., B.Litt., and Miss MARGARET PEEL, B.A. - - - - - - - 279

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS - - - - - - - - - 287

CORRESPONDENCE—

THE FORTY AND FIVE OR THE NINETY AND NINE - - - - - - - - A. W. EDWARDS 288

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

THE LIVINGSTONE PRESS

INTO ACTION
By A. M. CHIRGWIN, M.A., D.D.
An important survey of the Church in the world to-day. Readers of "Under Fire" will welcome this further volume.
Price **2/6** net

CHIANG KAI-SHEK AND THE UNITY OF CHINA
By JOYCE REASON
A well-written appreciation of a great leader who has "merged his hopes, his ambitions, even his personality, in his country."
Price **2**/- net

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS
By CECIL NORTHCOTT
A pamphlet which surveys the work and triumph of Christian Missions.
Price **4**d. net

THE CHURCH IN THE SOUTH SEAS
By NORMAN GOODALL
The future of the Christian work in the Pacific as seen in terms of advance.
Price **4**d. net

TRIPLE JUBILEE PAPERS

No. 1 THE NEW ADVANCE.
By A. M. CHIRGWIN
No. 2 BEFORE THE START.
By ERNEST PAYNE
No. 3 THE GLORIOUS GOSPEL.
By P. T. FORSYTH
No. 4 CONGREGATIONALISM AND THE WORLD CHURCH.
By H. CUNLIFFE-JONES
No. 5 FREEDOM FOR ALL MEN.
By HAROLD MOODY
No. 6 THE WORD IN ACTION.
By RONALD K. ORCHARD
No. 7 THE MODERN MISSIONARY.
By C. B. FIRTH
No. 8 THE YOUNGER CHURCHES.
By A. M. CHIRGWIN
No. 9 A MINISTRY IN THE MAKING.
By W. SCOPES
No. 10 MEDICAL MISSIONS TO-DAY.
By T. H. SOMERVELL
Price **4**d. each net

PRAYER AND PREPARATION NOTES
Edited by JOYCE RUTHERFORD
These pamphlets are issued in view of the Triple Jubilee of L.M.S., and should be studied in every Church and home.
Series I, price **2**d. net
Series II, price **3**d. net

Your orders for these and other book requirements will receive prompt attention from:–

THE LIVINGSTONE PRESS,
42 BROADWAY, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.

The Congregational Devotional Book, 1944

THE DRAMA OF THE CROSS

C. STANLEY HERBERT, B.D., with a Foreword by Dr. SIDNEY BERRY.

"To focus the thoughts of all of us on some of the great themes of the Christian faith."

Cloth, Gilt. 5s. net
(Post 4d.)

Of all Booksellers

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

Now on Sale

THE CHRISTIAN BASIS OF DEMOCRACY
Essays delivered in the University of North Wales

ALBERT PEEL, M.A., Litt.D.

"A powerful and persuasive plea for true democracy, based on Christian liberty."—*Inquirer.*

Cloth. 4s. 6d.
(Post 3d.)

Of all Booksellers

Independent Press Ltd.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. G. Scott Williamson, M.C. Director of the Peckham Experiment.

Mr. William E. Wilson, B.D. Formerly Professor in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham. Author of *The Problem of the Cross*.

The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D. Formerly Principal of All Nations Bible College, London. Minister of Castle Gate Baptist Church, Berwick-on-Tweed.

The Rev. G. C. Edmonds, M.A. Congregational Minister, Oxted.

Mr. Arnold Nichols. Lay Preacher, and member of Dorchester Congregational Church.

Mr. A. E. Harper. Deacon and Treasurer of Whetstone Congregational Church.

Mr. Alec R. Ellis. Bank Clerk, Scout Master, Rover Leader, Official Visitor and Organizer of Adult Education Scheme at H.M.'s Prison, Liverpool.

The Rev. J. D. Copp, B.A. L.M.S. Missionary, Samoa.

The Rev. Ernest Woolhouse. Methodist Minister, Norton, Sheffield.

The Rev. John Davies. Congregational Minister, Coventry.

The Rev. K. G. Ogilvie, M.A. Congregational Minister, King's Norton, Birmingham.

Mr. W. R. Niblett, B.A., B.Litt. Acting Registrar, Durham University.

RYDAL SCHOOL

CONWAY

Headmaster - - THE REV. A. J. COSTAIN, M.A. (Oxon.)

An Examination is held annually in June when Scholarships and Exhibitions varying in value from £80—£20 are offered. Candidates must be under 14½ years on June 1st.

Particulars and Prospectus from—

THE BURSAR - - RYDAL SCHOOL - CONWAY

Ready Shortly

CHURCH YOUTH TRAINING

The Church Training Fellowship Handbook

Edited by

H. A. HAMILTON,

and published for the

Youth and Education Department

Crown 8vo. Paper, 2s. 6d. Cloth, 4s.

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.

Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

Ready Shortly

Lectures on

A BACKGROUND TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

By

LEONARD T. TOWERS M.A.

Crown 8vo. Cloth,

3s. 6d.

Independent Press Ltd.

Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

SILCOATES SCHOOL

Nr. WAKEFIELD

Headmaster: FRANK A. SPENCER, M.A.

About 30 Foundation Bursaries are available for sons of Congregational Ministers and Missionaries.

There are valuable Leaving Scholarships for sons of Congregationalists, tenable at any place of higher education.

For all particulars apply to The Headmaster

Just Published

THE GREAT ISSUE

and other war-time studies

BY

SIDNEY M. BERRY, M.A., D.D.

This book consists of 52 short sermons which have appeared in the *Sunday Times* and are now issued in book form in response to insistent requests from readers.

Cr. 8vo. 112 pp. Cloth, gilt, 4s. 6d. (Post 3d.)

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD,
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

Ready July

FREEDOM in the FAITH

A plea for a Liberal Theology

BY

W. B. SELBIE, D.D.

An entirely new book, of which the author passed proofs only three weeks before he died on April 28.

Cr. 8vo. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (Post 3d.)

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

BOOK NEWS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS IS PIONEERING THE WAY FOR EDUCATIONAL ADVANCE IN CHURCH, SCHOOL, CLUB AND HOME

—Send for Lists

RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN SCHOOLS

By A. C. TOYNE, M.A.

A thought-provoking book on the Syllabus—should it deal with Biblical facts or the Christian way of life?

Price **1/6** net (by post **1/8**)

HEROES OF THE CALL & QUEST

New Volume now ready in our Teachers' Guides to the Agreed Syllabuses:

43 Lessons for Junior Classes.

From O.T., N.T., and Church History, with full lesson outlines, study notes, and suggestions for handwork and scholars' activities.

"Unsurpassed in the quality of their material, the freshness and variety of their method, and their practical acquaintance with the teacher's task, these Guides are rich in suggestion and useful as books of reference." —*Religion in Education.*

Cloth boards, price **5/-**
Paper cover **4/6** (postage **4**d.)

Just Reprinted—

MYSELF AND MY FELLOWS

43 Lessons on Christianity and the Service of Others.

Cloth boards **5/-**; paper **4/6** (postage **4**d.)
For Senior Classes and Upper Forms.

Six other Teachers' Guides now in print for Senior, Infants, Junior and Nursery grades—list free.

BIBLE PUPPETRY

Glove Puppets for Bible Teaching.

By H. W. WHANSLAW

Introducing a new method for making the Bible "come alive." With 14 full-page plates, many smaller illustrations, explanatory text, and a complete Bible Puppet Play.

Price **2/-** net (postage **2**d.)

THE SCHOOL ASSEMBLY

By J. M. MACDOUGALL FERGUSON

61 Services of Worship for Secondary Schools, each built round a theme of immediate interest to the pupils.

Bound in strong buckram boards, price **6/-** (by post **6/4**)

THE GAME OF LIFE

By Dr. ALBERT D. BELDEN

Breezy talks with the children on the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule. With Frontispiece and attractive jacket.

Cloth boards, price **3/6** net (postage **2**d.)

EPILOGUES FOR YOUTH

A Guide to Club Prayers

By J. W. SINGLETON, B.A., and R. G. MARTIN, M.A.

"The best thing of its kind so far published."

Price **1/6** (postage **2**d.)

TEACHERS OF TO-DAY

A forward-looking Quarterly and News Review. New number now ready with Youth Supplement. Price **2**d. per copy (by post **3**d.), or **1/-** per year, post paid.

Copies of any of the above sent on approval on receipt of postage

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS LTD. - Manor Road, Wallington, Surrey

The Book that holds the Key of LIFE & DEATH

IT IS OUR SACRED TASK TO CIRCULATE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD IN EVERY LIVING TONGUE

Already the Bible has been translated, in whole or part, into over a thousand different languages or dialects. The demand for this Book of God in the common homely speech of men in all parts of the earth is overwhelming.

Your interest, your gifts, your service could ease and speed our work, and bring to those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death the promises of this Book of Life.

THE BRITISH & FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY

146, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

In his book on *The Nonconformist Conscience* Dr. Lovell Cocks says that the second phase in the career of English political Nonconformity runs from the Reform Bill of 1867 to the disruption of the Liberal Party in 1886, and that "the greatest exploits of Nonconformity in this second phase were achieved not on the stricken field of national politics but in the less heroic setting of municipal government". These words, which are certainly true, give rise to the melancholy reflection that Nonconformity has lost a great deal of its power to influence public affairs. Dr. Cocks gives as an example of the strength of Nonconformity in the '70s and '80s the transformation of the municipal life of Birmingham by Joseph Chamberlain and his associates, and adds, "Not every town could boast a Chamberlain and a Dale, but what they did for Birmingham was being done by other Nonconformist mayors, councillors, and ministers throughout England". But Dale was only one of several Nonconformist ministers who exercised a decisive influence on the rapidly expanding life of Birmingham. A former Lord Mayor (Alderman Wilfrid Martineau) said not long ago that there grew up a sort of Chamberlain legend, "but if you will read a little local history you will come soon to understand how much Chamberlain owed to his team—Bunce, Crosskey, Dale, Dawson, Dixon, Vince, and a host of others. Of the six named, no less than *four* were ministers of religion".

How can the great and salutary influence of Nonconformity (and of organized Christianity generally) be revived? Even if these giants of the past could return, it is more than doubtful whether they could affect the whole tone and trend of public affairs as once they did. Dr. Cocks begins his book by telling us that the term "the Nonconformist Conscience" took its place in our language when Hugh Price Hughes, from the platform of his West London Mission, demanded (and ultimately brought about) the resignation of Parnell, who had been proved guilty of adultery. A great part of Dale's power in the city was the result of the speeches he made in the Town Hall. "On the platform of the Town Hall", says his biographer, "the vigour with which he pulled off his overcoat as he rose to speak was a sure sign of what was coming". That was the age of public meetings, when people would flock to hear speeches (and sometimes to join in the fun themselves) on

municipal issues which would arouse hardly a passing flicker of interest in their less civic-conscious descendants. We have to accept the fact that even men of a stature comparable to that of Dale and Clifford would not now be able to exert such an influence *directly*. By this we do not mean to suggest that what Christian ministers can achieve through pulpit, platform and press to determine the course of events and the tone of municipal life is negligible. But they must reckon with the fact that their strongest influence is likely to be exercised *indirectly*.

Surely, it is the task of the churches to train men and women of character and ability for public and civic life. Here is an opening for a bit of co-operative work in which Anglican and Free Churches could unite, for there are no denominational differences of view as to what is desirable in the life of the community. We should like to see the right sort of young and youngish men and women picked out of the churches of all denominations and prepared for civic and political responsibilities by a thorough and rigorous training, which would extend over several years. They should attend adequate courses of instruction in Christian ethics, in municipal government and in the problems which arise in the community—housing, education, health, and so on. Moreover, they should have a thorough grounding in the art of straight thinking, for the crooked and woolly thinking of many local and national politicians is lamentable. They should be taught to speak in public and to debate effectively. This seems to be the age of "planning", and the Church must plan to provide leaders, for it is vital that the life of the community shall be shaped by people with a real sense of spiritual values. The ends of the Kingdom of God would not be best served by the formation of a "Christian Party" in either Town Council or Parliament, but we do need more people in positions of responsibility in public life who are really and unashamedly Christian. And they must be as well equipped as we can make them. The children of light must not be less wise or less competent than the children of this world. The infusion of liberal doses of Christian sentimentality into public life will never get us far. But the incursion of numbers of resolute and well-trained Christian men and women into national and municipal affairs would cause things to happen!

* * *

In listening to the conversation of ministers of an older generation, we are often impressed (and sometimes a little humiliated) by their knowledge of English literature. We have a notion, which we hope is ill-founded, that each generation of ministers knows rather less than its predecessor of the treasures of literature. In rereading lately Dr. John Oman's book *Concerning the Ministry*, we found him bewailing this ignorance, though he does not suggest

that the condition is of recent growth. "All kinds of defects in our present system of theological education are vociferously insisted on, but I am not sure of ever having heard what seems to me the chief defect even mentioned. This I take to be the ignorance of literature, and more particularly of English literature". It is hardly reasonable to suggest that theological colleges should add English literature to all the other subjects which they are constantly being told they *ought* to teach. The list grows longer every year! It may be, however, that a member of the staff with a love for literature could communicate his enthusiasm to students who had not been awakened to the wonders awaiting discovery. Some of us did not have the luck to meet an "Elam" at school, and were given to understand that the chief characteristic of Shakespeare was a tiresome habit of using obsolete words which had to be elucidated by notes at the back of the book. This was "doing" Shakespeare. By the particular blessing of Providence we met during our first year at a theological college a professor with a passion for literature. Mainly during afternoons in his study he succeeded, partially at any rate, in opening our eyes to what we had missed. Once a man is so awakened, he can pursue the delights of literature for himself and he can get most of the guidance he needs from histories or works of criticism. Perhaps a member of a college staff could draw up a course of reading which could be made available for men who want to fill up this gap in their education, and they could take it at their leisure after they had gone down.

Dr. Oman suggests that this ignorance of literature is the reason why, in preaching, there is often "so much argufying and rambling remarks, without order, form or distinction". He has certainly put his finger on a weakness which is the bane of much of our preaching, and he may very well be right as to its cause. Formlessness is the reason why so many sermons are ineffective. One does not know whence the preacher comes or whither he proposes to go and doubts whether he has any clear idea himself. If we kept company with the masters, we should be more likely to express forcefully and aptly what we have to say. But they have much more to give us than style. They will tell us more that is worth knowing about life than a multitude of textbooks on all sorts of subjects—and a preacher should be ready to listen to anybody who can speak with insight about life.

Perhaps the reason why the older ministers know more of literature than the younger generation—if we are right in the assumption that they do—is that they were not so overwhelmed by a spate of topical books and pamphlets. We feel that we have to read as many of them as we can if we are going to be "up-to-date", and most of us complain that we have less and less time for reading anything. It might be advisable to risk being a little less up-to-date

if thereby we could make time to absorb some really great literature. It might also happen that our preaching would gain something in attractiveness—and depth.

* * *

PERHAPS it was unreasonable to look hopefully through the report of the House of Commons debate on the extension and use of scientific research for some recognition of the fact that science—like patriotism—is not enough. Mr. Attlee told the House that the Government is fully alive to the fact that the winning of the peace, like the winning of the war, will largely depend on a full and right use of the scientists. Another member seemed inclined to stake a claim for science without even the qualification implied in the word "largely". When peace comes, prosperity, he said, can *once more* be won by the aid of science. If he meant to imply that, at some previous time, science had already won prosperity, there are probably a few million people with bitter memories of months and years of unemployment who would like to ask him just when that was. Mr. Attlee said there would have to be a much greater expenditure on research and teaching at the universities, and added that the Government had been considering the need for establishing a fund to meet the cost of developing new inventions.

Well, we cannot reasonably quarrel with sound measures to advance scientific research. A certain bishop some time ago did propose a close season of twenty years for scientific invention. That was crying for the moon and was evidence of a defeatist spirit anyhow. We cannot hope to catch up morally and spiritually with the progress of science by barring its path with "Stop" and "Go" signs. Perhaps it would not have been within the scope of this debate if somebody had pointed out that there are other sciences besides the physical ones which could be subsidized. In which case there might be another debate! We get the impression that the development of the sciences is to be made still more "lopsided", as Dr. McDougall put it some years ago. As he pointed out, the physical sciences, which lead to discoveries and inventions of industrial value capable of being reckoned in terms of hard cash, have forged ahead and their pace is constantly increasing. They are heavily subsidized by industry. But the sciences of life—biology, psychology, political science, economics, and so forth—have been allowed to lag behind. A British scientist, Dr. C. H. Waddington, sums up the position:

> . . . the business world is not primarily interested in the investigation of social life, or in the formulation of what the scientific attitude has to contribute to it. Why should it be? Business men are caught up in a war to the death with their rivals, and what they want from scientific research is something which will help them to keep their heads above water—

results which pay. Even if a successful man of affairs rises above the struggle and can indulge his fancy, his world is the world of production and manufacture, the sciences he is likely to be interested in are the technical ones, chemistry and physics and their newer offshoots. He is more likely to found a professorship in something like surface chemistry or crystal physics; perhaps only a retired advertising magnate would be expected to be primarily interested in social psychology.

Whatever may be true of industrial magnates, Governments, responsible for the welfare of their peoples, should be interested in the sciences of life, for they should know that real "prosperity" is something which the physical sciences alone can never win for us no matter how heavily they are subsidized.

* * *

An interesting and significant appointment was announced recently. The Rev. H. J. S. Guntrip, of Leeds, has become "Lecturer in the Relation of Psychology to Medicine" in the Medical School of Leeds University. This event arouses interesting speculations as to the future possibilities of co-operation between the medical profession and the ministry. There are, of course, whole areas of psychiatry which are completely outside the range of non-medical men. The minister with a smattering of psychological knowledge who sets up as a "psycho-analyst" is a positive menace, though it must be said that most of the self-styled "psychologists" we meet are far less responsible people than parsons. Within our own proper sphere as pastors we are all of us, consciously or unconsciously, psychologists, for we are—or we ought to be—constantly helping people in moral, emotional and spiritual troubles to relieve their burdened minds. Many doctors recognize the value of our work in that field, though they may suspect that some of us are not as well equipped as we might be to do it, which is, unfortunately, a fact. Some time ago the superintendent of a great mental institution, who conducts clinics in local hospitals, was talking about his cases and the sheer impossibility of finding time to deal adequately with them. "Most of them", he said, "should never have come to me. They should have gone to a parson". He meant that their original troubles and difficulties were such as a parson, if he had some psychological knowledge, would be able to deal with. But for one reason or another, the patients did not go to a parson, or, for that matter, to a doctor, with the result that anxiety was generated which could not be cleared up without the help of a psychotherapist. With adequate training and in co-operation with doctors, ministers could do a great deal to lift the burden of mental suffering and the ill-health and inefficiency which arise from it. The prejudice on the part of the medical profession which was once widespread (and which still

exists in some quarters) is breaking down. Mr. Guntrip wrote recently:

> The Medical Profession today is showing a fine, large-minded willingness to co-operate with non-medicals, who command its respect, in the task of understanding and helping burdened human nature. The "Committee on Psychological Medicine" has produced an Interim Report on "Undergraduate Education in Psychiatry" in which it says, "The syllabus proposed may necessitate the employment of extra-mural teachers, *e.g.*, in psychology. It is not possible to lay down conditions as to the qualifications of such teachers, whose suitability must be decided by the Academic Board of each Medical School".
>
> If ministers would co-operate with doctors, it is for us to command respect by being properly trained and efficient in the task of helping people in their personal difficulties. This calls for reading more than a few books on psychology and being keen on the subject. One should add that without a capacity for sympathetic insight, no technical training could make one adequate to the "cure of souls". The Medical Profession has a right to ask a high standard of us.

Beyond what the ordinary man could and ought to do in his everyday work, there is room here for a specialized ministry. We should watch for men and women who have a special capacity for it. No amount of book-learning, as Mr. Guntrip points out, will make a man successful if he has no gift, though adequate training may develop a moderate aptitude into really useful skill. Probably nobody ought to begin this specialized training until he is somewhere about thirty, for he will not have the necessary knowledge of life. It might be a good thing to set up in a suitable city a centre for Pastoral Psychology to which suitable ministers, who have had some years in a church, could go for specialized training and clinical experience under competent supervision. That might mean they would have to be subsidized by a system of bursaries. Will the "Reconstruction Fund" run to it? Anyway, the first need is that we should realize more clearly than many of us do the necessity for the extension of this kind of ministry. Some theologians seem to have a deep-seated suspicion of psychology. Are they afraid that it will explain away sin and so make a good deal of their theologizing unnecessary? There is surely no need for alarm! When psychology has shown that a great many people are sick rather than sinful there will still be enough downright wickedness left to keep theologians going for a long time.

* * *

In an address to the Royal Institution, Mr. Stanley Unwin said some pertinent things about the difficulties under which publishers are labouring. He pointed out the strange anomaly that the

Government should pay lip service to the importance of books and then put quite unnecessary obstacles in the way of their production:

> There is something more than ironical in the fact that at the moment when, for the first time, the public is clamouring not merely for books but for good books, most of the good books are unobtainable or in short supply.

He went on to show that if the industry had been allowed the almost negligible amount of paper and labour which would have enabled it to meet the demand, the war effort would not have been affected:

> We talk as if the maintenance of an adequate supply were unobtainable, whereas if it is granted that books are really wanted, there is no problem at all. We consistently show a contempt for books. They were the first, not the last things to suffer from the paper shortage. A leading Cabinet Minister even had the temerity to state that there were plenty of books in the country and that it would not matter if no more were produced for the duration.

In the early days of the war we heard a member of a local public library committee arguing, on grounds of economy, that no more books should be bought during the war because there were already plenty on the shelves which people had not read. But a Cabinet Minister . . . !

* * *

Little is known by most people of the Protestant Church in France, and for that reason Mrs. Jessie Forsyth Andrews' pamphlet, *Christian France Today* (S.C.M., 9d.), is especially welcome. The Protestants have never been very numerous. At the turn of the century they numbered a million, but soon after the close of the last war they had decreased to about 600,000.

> But they count for more than mere figures would imply, because of their force of character, their high ideals of citizenship and education, and their progressive outlook.

This comparatively small body of Protestants was divided into several denominations and all efforts at reunion had failed. But in the years when Protestantism was losing in numbers it was gaining in strength. The revival took the form not of expansion outwards but of a deeper unity within, and Protestants have become knit in one communion. Moreover, in the dismal years between the wars there came a great awakening of Roman Catholicism, especially among young people. Mrs. Andrews concludes with the hopeful words of M. André Philip, who sees great hope for the future in this double revival:

> The Fourth Republic of tomorrow will be a new democracy in which Christianity will have a vital share . . .

by its influence on the whole spiritual life of the people. For these two spiritual forces, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, formerly in conflict, have recognised each other and joined hands. I believe that the France of tomorrow will be a France of spirituality.

It is hoped that Protestants in this country will be able to give a good deal of practical help after the war to their brethren on the continent of Europe. As Dr. Garvie said in a recent appeal, they are in a small minority in the Latin countries and have a permanent claim on our sympathy.

* * *

By the passing of Dr. W. B. Selbie the Church has lost an honoured leader and Oxford one of her finest citizens. Hundreds of men and women throughout the world, many of whom came under Selbie's influence in their undergraduate days, will feel a sense of deep personal loss, and what some of them owe to him can never be told. Dr. Selbie was one of the original members of the Editorial Board of the *Quarterly*, and gave valuable help and counsel to the end. It is not possible to include a longer appreciation of him in this issue, but the October number will contain a tribute written by the Rev. Norman Goodall. L. J. T.

* * *

Our remarks on the menace of Japan have led an American reader to send us a copy of a book not yet published in this country—Mr. Hillis Lory's *Japan's Military Masters*. Introduced by Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, this account of "the Army in Japanese Life" presents an alarming picture, painted as it is by one who lived for many years in the country. The description of the fanatical belief of the Japanese in the Divine Emperor who is also Commander-in-Chief, trained from infancy to regard his country as the divinely-appointed ruler of the Orient, and led to prepare for war for many years in the assumption that in "a decade Japan would be the strongest nation in the world", concludes with the conviction, "We can expect Japan to fight virtually until her last soldier is killed and her last ship is sunk".

Mr. Lory shares the view of the well-informed observer quoted by us six months ago. "We have", he says, "heard much about what Hitler wants us to believe, but too little about what Tojo has wanted us to believe". He maintains that for many years Japan has carried out a policy of deception while her preparations have been going on, and that she is fully equipped for a long and exhaustive war. She is now a nation of great wealth, controlling 4,600,000 square miles, with 60 per cent of the world's tin, and with oil, rubber, iron, tungsten, copper, and chromium. Even more important is her reserve of man-power, for she controls two and a half times as many people as are under German domination.

By relying on their colour prejudice—the yellow man versus the white—and exploiting their poverty she has in her subjugated peoples a reasonably dependable reserve of man-power to release the Nipponese for the front line. Mr. Lory does not believe that time is with the United Nations. With the raw materials and man-power she has at her disposal Japan can train millions for mass production if she is given the time.

> Of all Japan's assets, none is more important than this high morale of the Japanese Army and people alike—bred in feudalistic thought, fired by a fanatic devotion to an Emperor-God, impelled by a will to win, drunk on their dreams of a white man's defeat, trained not to live for their country, but to die for a greater Japan.

No, victory for the United Nations in the East will *not* be easy. And how to bring a vanquished Japan into a family of democratic peoples—this makes even the European problem look simplicity itself.

* * *

PERHAPS the most important feature of Miss Maude Petre's study of Loisy (see p. 281) is that it is

> the expression of a problem that besets many a religious mind when it becomes conscious, either of the chilling effects of rigid dogma on spiritual experience, or of the disturbing character of the conflict between orthodoxy and truth.

This phase of the situation does not seem to have occurred to some of the timorous souls who clamour for more dogma in the churches and "definite Church teaching within the schools". At a time when Christianity should be making every effort to win those who have been attracted by the life and teaching of Jesus, the result is to make them shy away in regret or resentment. Loisy himself put the matter well half a century ago:

> What we have to do is to renew theology from top to bottom, to substitute the religious for the dogmatic spirit, to seek the soul of theological truth, and leave reason free under the control of conscience.

Because he saw no sign that the Roman Church was prepared to do this he believed that Roman Catholicism would perish: "it could survive by transforming itself, but it will not". Is the same to be said about the other Churches? Probably the next generation will show. If the cries for dogma and the emphasis on the immobility of religious doctrine and belief were to prove acceptable, then Ichabod could be painted on the portals of the Church as we have known it.

And of all the demands made for doctrinal rigidity, that for emphasis on the sin of man remains the most persistent. Here again a word of Loisy is relevant: "No great work can be accom-

plished in this world save by those with faith in mankind''. Miss Petre points out that religion

> is nothing else than faith in mankind, which implies faith in something higher and greater than mankind, but present to mankind.

The Christian religion proclaims a God of love, whose grace conquers sin, and whose Son came to seek and to save lost men. To let the black cloud of man's sin obscure the light of the sun is to condemn the world to darkness and the Church to death, when the Light of the World came that men might have light and life abundant.

In a review of M. Jacques Maritain's works Prof. Theodore M. Green has some pertinent words on the point raised in this paragraph:

> All clear-headed Christians sensitive to the demands of religion would, or should, agree. But when M. Maritain goes on to say, ''I know very well that if I lost my faith *in the least article* of revealed truth, I should lose my soul'', he is expressing that attitude, typical of Roman Catholics but present also in Protestant communions, which makes genuine Christian co-operation so difficult. Dogmas, regarded as basic articles of faith, are essential in any church as a ''community of believers''; they constitute its common theological foundation. Dogmatism, in contrast, is uncritical and unwavering acceptance of dogmas as the final and absolute word of God. Dogmatists are always guilty of what might be called the fallacy of misplaced absolutism. Christians believe that God is absolute; dogmatists assert that their (or their church's) conception of God is absolute. Christians believe that God is omniscient; dogmatists assert, in effect, that the dogmas which they accept are infallible. It is this dogmatism which seems to many of us to be neither philosophically honest nor truly Christian, since it repudiates both philosophical humility and the humility which Christianity demands of all professing Christians. (M. Maritain will forgive me—he would be the first to insist on absolute candor.) It is this dogmatism, moreover, which threatens to wreck all efforts towards church union and which alienates so many thoughtful and sincere men and women from the church of Christ. M. Maritain is clearly right, however, in pointing out that real co-operation is possible among Christians on the basis ''of the heart and of love'', and among all men of good will on the basis of ''civic friendship''.

* * *

If the Bishop of Durham lacked the courage to decline the invitation to write an Oxford Pamphlet (6d.) on *The Churches in Britain,* yet he has made a valiant attempt to carry out the contract. Indeed, in some ways he is quite successful, but it is a pity

he did not insist on limiting his sketch to the Church of England only. The weakness of the treatment of the Free Churches is suggested by the fact that the only book relating to them suggested "for further reading" is B. L. Manning's *Essays in Orthodox Dissent*. One or two sentences, with comments attached, from the page dealing with Congregationalism, will reveal how easy it is to stumble when on unfamiliar ground:

> All Congregationalists give great scope to the laity [in fact, lay preachers are used far too little, and the churches are too often "a one-man show", with the minister doing far too much]: the extremists among them tend to exalt the authority of the church meeting to such a point that the minister, called by the congregation, is of little account, especially if he fails to please [the 'church meeting', it has to be confessed, often fails to function, and so has little 'authority'; a minister is called by the 'church' and not by the 'congregation']. Democracy sometimes runs riot. [We should like to think so, for this would be a sign of life. But the tendency is to leave too much to minister and deacons.] Or again, refusal to accept any credal statement as finally valid is sometimes stretched to cover a denial that there is any 'everlasting Gospel'. [Evidence, please! With a fairly intimate knowledge of the Congregational churches for thirty years we know of no case to which this statement applies.] The rule of admission to the Church by baptism is sometimes broken. ["The rule?" Whose rule?]

No, the Bishop had better try again, and let someone "vet" his copy. Or perhaps the Oxford Press had better ask a Free Churchman to write on the Free Churches.

* * *

THE Prime Minister answers a question on the day he advocates Basic English in the House of Commons:

> I gather that he was embarking on a purely philosophical, hypothetical, and conjectural situation which might arise after the war.

* * *

A BLACK preacher aptly introduces a white missionary:

> Brethren, it is not often I arise to present a white speaker in dis chapel. But you can be sure he has a powerful message for you. And while his skin may be white, his heart is as black as any of ours.

* * *

WE do not know how far Mr. Eric Hayman in *Worship and the Common Life* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) represents the Society of Friends, or how far it will make members of the Society feel anxious about him. In his anxiety to be fair to those who practise

the Sacraments he "leans over backwards", as the Americans say, and often uses terms like "sacrament" and "altar" in a way that is certain to mislead. He also speaks of the Eucharist as "the central act of Christian worship", and says "Christians in all parts of the world agree in regarding the experience of sacramental worship as central", statements often made but rarely examined: there are millions of Christians—the Presbyterians of Scotland may be taken as an illustration—who give the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper its full and rightful place who would hesitate to use a term like "central" which seems to relegate the preaching of the Word to a secondary position.

It is not easy at first to see what Mr. Hayman is aiming at, though in the second—and much clearer—part of the book he tells us it is "the integrating of worship and common life", and develops the Quaker thesis of "the sacramental offering of the common life of men as the material for God's sacrament". Here, in the discussion of the relationship of the Friends to the ecumenical movement he makes the valuable and constructive suggestion that, as a kind of Order within the Church, Friends could find a place and make their distinctive contribution.

We do not know how Friends like Rendel Harris and Neave Brayshaw would have regarded Mr. Hayman's suggestions, but we confess ourselves worried by the attitude of Friends to other Churches. In these pages and elsewhere we have fought against any definition of the Church which would exclude Friends, but regretfully we have to confess that we have discerned little eagerness on their part to share in the worship and service of the Churches, and there must be local manifestations of unity before such a proposal of Mr. Hayman's becomes feasible. We wish Friends and others would tell us of any work and worship there is in common, and *why there is not more.*

Another cause of disquiet in this Quaker book is the way its author has caught the epidemic of the moment. He puts up dolls he calls "liberal humanism", and gleefully and easily knocks them down; he quotes all the people it is fashionable to quote, with the exception of Kierkegaard. With the rest of his school he is so the slave of the *Zeitgeist* that he forgets the Spirit of the Living God. Evil is blatant in the world, so sin is allowed to blot out the grace of God; men have become lax in their lives, so we must have authority, and loose in their thinking, so we must have dogma. History and perspective should prevent Christians from being unduly swayed by events, and today there is special need that they should hear the exhortation to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage".

* * *

FEW things arouse our indignation more than the glib and easy way some of our mentors, when discussing sex problems, dispose of the situation of the millions of women whom modern civilization deprives of marriage and motherhood. Facile talk about sublimation by men happy and content, but woefully ignorant, can be little less than cruel. The lot of the surplus woman after the war is one to which the Church of Christ should be giving ceaseless attention—and there is little sign that it is giving any attention at all. When we remember the topics discussed at Church Assemblies and think of the important things never so much as mentioned we are at times almost inclined to despair. We were led to this line of thought by a story in Ramsay Muir's autobiography. One day in the course of pastoral visitation his father found a lonely old spinster weeping. To his sympathetic inquiries she answered that she had been day-dreaming:

> "I thought that if I had married, I might have had a daughter, and her name would have been Jeannie, and she would have married, and had a wean, and I was thinking about Jeannie's wean, the darling, and I saw him cut his finger, and the blood was pouring. So I was greeting about Jeannie's wean's finger."

* * *

THE cynic points out that the "Yes-man" is not an American product: husbands existed before America was discovered.

* * *

WHEN the history of our times comes to be written somebody may suggest that an appropriate title will be "The Decline of the Amateur", for in religious and political life alike this is certainly one of the most significant features. And this is not merely a matter of the professional politician, a result of the payment of Members of Parliament, though even there the absence of men of means and of the professions who went into politics with the unmixed motive of serving their country is a considerable loss. It is also seen in the appointment of Civil Servants such as Sir John Anderson and Sir James Grigg to high political office. The expert, instead of being adviser to the Minister, now becomes Minister himself.

In the life of the Church this phenomenon is most clearly seen in regard to youth work. A couple of generations ago the youth work of the land was performed by the Churches: it was the local church which started cricket and football clubs, rambling and debating societies, and at a later date, gymnasia, badminton clubs, dramatic societies, and sometimes even dancing classes. It was in connexion with the churches that choral societies, concert parties, local eisteddfods, were held; it was in the churches that young men learnt to speak and to express themselves in other ways. All these

activities were maintained by voluntary effort, and it is impossible to praise too highly the sacrificial service of many thousands of people who gave the greater part of their leisure to the service of youth in these varied fields, which often were the legitimate outcome of Sunday Schools.

But here as elsewhere the amateur has had his day. The well-meant but crude entertainment which provided Saturday evening recreation in thousands of church halls naturally does not satisfy an age which can listen to the best artistes of the country on the air. The Churches have been slow to learn that they cannot compete with the entertainment world in music and drama, and the young people who want to dance naturally are not content with the Sunday School floor or the superintendent's violin. And now comes the trained and professional organizer of Youth Clubs, with a carefully thought out scheme of activities and at least a smattering of psychology. How can the local church meet such a situation, with its out-of-date buildings (where the military have not taken them), its earnest but ill-equipped leaders and social workers, its inadequate resources?

To attempt to compete is folly. The policy for the Church, in this as in all modern situations, is to become professional in its turn, to become expert in its own business. And that business is just the growing of good men and women, Christian men and women. If the Church sends into the world Christian youth-leaders, into the entertainment field Christian entertainers, and into the schools Christian teachers, the Church is then doing what it exists to do. The training will be right, the entertainment healthy, and the teaching sound, if the Church sees that the right people are in charge of them all.

* * *

PROPHECY is always dangerous, and never more so than in wartime. A remarkable instance of it is recorded of Samuel Davies, who succeeded Jonathan Edwards as President of the College of New Jersey. Davies, it is to be feared, is known in this country only as the writer of the hymn, "Great God of wonders, all Thy ways". He was perhaps the first great American-born hymn-writer, and to him in large measure the introduction of Watts's hymns to America was due. Had he not died, in 1761, at the age of 37, his abilities would have made him a leader among the American people. In 1755 he preached a sermon before the colonial troops who had been under the command of George Washington, adding this note when the sermon was printed (the italics are ours):

> As a remarkable instance of this, I may point out to the public that heroic youth, Colonel Washington, whom I cannot

but hope *Providence has hitherto preserved in so signal a manner for some important service to his country.*

* * *

It is now some time since Miss Edna St. Vincent Millay wrote in *Conversation at Midnight*—and wrote with truth:

> It is advertising that has been the death of words:
> The word "Personal" now on an envelope means "impersonal";
> "Important", "unimportant".
> "The Finest", "the Best", "the Purest"—what do they mean now?:—
> Something somebody wants to sell.
>
> We are a nation of word-killers: hero, veteran, tragedy,—
> Watch the great words go down.

That has point in Britain as well as the United States. Will one result of the war be a greater realism, and a greater accuracy, in the use of words? One thing at any rate is clear—there will be many we can speak of as "heroes" without a qualm, men whose deeds match the word.

* * *

Date, please?

> Belief, Faith has well-nigh vanished from the world. The youth on awakening in this wondrous Universe no longer finds a competent theory of its wonders. Time was, when if he asked himself, What is man, What are the duties of man? the answer stood ready written for him. But now the ancient "ground-plan of the All" belies itself when brought into contact with reality; Mother Church has, to the most, become a superannuated Step-mother, whose lessons go disregarded, or are spurned at, and scornfully gainsaid.

Thomas Carlyle in *Characteristics,* 1831.

* * *

A reminder from Mr. Dooley for when victory comes:

> "Whin we plant what Hogan calls th' starry banner iv freedom in th' Ph'lippeens", said Mr. Dooley, "an' give th' sacrid blessin' iv liberty to the poor downthrodden people iv thim unfortunate isles—dam thim—we' larn thim a lesson".

A. P.

EXPERIMENTAL LIVING.

By G. Scott Williamson, M.C., M.D.

Learning to live is one thing, learning to labour is another. We labour to live; we do not live to labour. The purpose of all mechanical progress is to give us more time to live. We call most of our mechanical services "labour saving". Who gets the savings? What do we do with our savings? Having laboured, do we live?

We do not. Largely, we become spectators of events. We pay professionals to fill in our leisure time—as though it were a hole in the road. We sit back, tempted by well-cushioned seats to look on, as spectators of a phantasy—being entertained in cinema, or theatre or elsewhere. We are not even amateurs of Living; we leave all that to the professional, and he stages unreal contests for our entertainment—for most of the professionals themselves are technicians, not artists, they are not dealing with reality either, but with artifice and phantasy. So, we give our savings of labour, our money and our time, to the purveyors of artificial phantasy.

We do not live, we sleep and we dream. Nay, it is worse than that, for we cannot even sleep; so we take hypnotics and anæsthetics so that we may dream. We become inactivated. The machine that is not used rusts and rots—so we become unhealthy, because we are neither living nor feeling. Feelings become anæsthetized, and living becomes recumbent star-gazing. Must this be so? We can only find the answer by experiment—by experimenting with people.

That needs a Scientist and a Laboratory.

We built one at Peckham and then we conducted the Peckham Experiment. The details of the experiment have been published in *The Peckham Experiment,* by Dr. I. H. Pearse and Miss L. H. Crocker[1]; here we touch only on some guiding principles.

The scientist's laboratory at Peckham took the form of a Family Club; Science and the People in double harness, married—or at least walking out together.

But, why a Family Club? Because, accurately and scientifically speaking, life originates in a family and grows in the garden called "home". Without the cultivated garden of home, life grows like a weed—anywhere, anyhow, and viciously. Hence, the laboratory at Peckham as a "Family Club" was an extension of the cultivated acre, the home.

The Club had to be furnished with equipment. Now there are two kinds of equipment—things and people. Both are essential;

[1] Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

for living means using things and people. We use physical things to satisfy our physical sensibilities. We use people and other biological entities to satisfy our biological or personal feelings.

Both things and people have to be—as in a great store—present in a great variety of sizes, shapes and kinds. So, we had all sizes, shapes and sorts of things, and all kinds of people—all ages, all wages, all tastes and all skills. It takes about two thousand families to get the proper mixture to fill a technical laboratory experimenting with people and things.

The scientist asks the question: What will people do with all sorts, shapes, and sizes of things and of people?

To get an answer, we had to create experimental conditions in which everybody was absolutely free to do as they felt—to act in accordance with their tastes, feelings, likes, and loves. There must be literally and absolutely no rules within the scientists' laboratory, which is a Family Club.

The scientist had to treat people as innocents—like babies. You cannot give innocents rules—babies cannot be given rules—so we did not force the people to obey any rule. In other words, there was no authority and so there was no rite and no ritual within the Club.

The scientist does not experiment for the fun of it, but only when he is testing the accuracy and truth of a conclusion, or hypothesis. Our hypothesis in the Peckham Experiment was that right, or order and ease, grows out of freedom.

Where did we get that conclusion or hypothesis? Out of our imagination by wishful thinking? No! By watching the chicken grow out of an egg. Inside the shell, there was nothing but a chick and a shell full of "all the chicken needed". If you crack the shell, the chick escapes and only the meat remains. So we concluded that Nature grows some living things by giving them all they need and rigidly excluding all outside interference—for there is nobody to tell the chick what to do with its shell stuffed full of meat. The egg is an autonomy.

Well then, the Centre was an egg-shell; we stuffed it "full of meat"; the chick inside the egg was a family. What would emerge from this egg? Do you see the rationale of the procedure? All the scientists had to do was to incubate the egg with the warmth of congeniality. We placed the autonomous egg in the syntonomy of congeniality. Inside the Centre—that is to say the egg—the family was free to do as it felt—to follow its tastes, feelings, likes, and loves.

Now we ourselves, the scientists, had made no rules; so we did not allow anybody else to make rules. There were dozens of little dictators, asking for rules and regulations; and dozens of would-be policemen offered to enforce any rules. We turned them all down.

If they did not like it, they could lump it—they were as free to leave the Club as they were to join the Club.

Further, there were no servants in the Club during Club hours. The people had to help themselves to what they liked—whether it was beer, wine, food, a dance, a swim, a song, a play, or information, *etc., etc.* So there were not even servants to make rules—and servants can be terrible tyrants. That is why we had nothing but self-service. Who would be free must help himself—even to freedom.

Alas, nobody today is used to being free; so when the Club first opened, the people did not know how to use their freedom. They did not know what freedom was for, because they did not know what they liked and loved. So, for six months, pandemonium and chaos reigned. However, as this was an experiment, we left them alone, and in six months, "order" began to grow, by itself, out of the collection of five hundred families—which is 1,700 persons of all ages and both sexes. Wisdom grew out of innocence—as a chicken grows out of the egg.

We watched it grow. That is one of the first fruits of the new branch of knowledge—the new Biology or Experimental Ethology. Hitherto, we have assumed that wisdom is hidden in a solid block of ignorance, like the statue in the stone, and that we had with chisel and mallet and much force to break through till the figure of wisdom was exposed. Now we know that wisdom grows; it is not made or fabricated. It grows as a fruit from the seed—which is innocence.

There were, then, no rules *within* the Club. There were, however, two conditions or rules to get into the Club as a member-family.

The scientist did not attempt to select special meat to put in the egg-shell, but he had to know what sort of meat it was that freely went into it. No family was rejected if it was willing to accept the first rule, or condition of admission, which was that everybody must learn all about himself.

It is no good trying to drive a motor-car or an aeroplane, unless you know how it works and unless you know that it is a sound machine that will work. Is the carburettor O.K.? What about the magneto? Are the tyres old and worn? Is the steering gear slack or tight? Are the springs all right? Is the petrol feed clear? Are the batteries charged? Are there any "shorts" in the wiring? And do you know how to read the dials on the dashboard, which tell you if you have got petrol in your tank and electricity in your battery, if you are charging your battery, what speed you are travelling, *etc.*? No pilot or driver of a motor-car would go on a dangerous experimental journey, such as life is, unless he knew something about his aeroplane or his car. You have either to

know your engine, or you have to move within a safety zone under control.

The first condition of admission then was that the scientists who were experts in human engines—anatomists and physiologists—should overhaul the machine and tell the driver what condition it was in, what it could do on the road and what load it would carry—for it was a family machine, built to carry passengers and things.

So, the people first learned all we could tell them about themselves. We told the pilot, or driver, all about his engine, the body.

Now, the pilot of the human machine is not the same as the machine. The proof of that is easy. Some pilots have good machines and are bad pilots; some pilots are good pilots and have bad machines.

The name of the machine you drive through existence is your *Physique*. The name of the pilot who drives your physique is your *Personality*. That is another new concept arising out of the new Biology, or Experimental Ethology.

Has it ever occurred to you that you are the pilot or driver of one of the most marvellous of all machines—your own body? It can sail on the sea like a ship, plumb the depths like a submarine; travel over any terrestrial obstacle like a caterpillar tractor; traverse the heights of the atmosphere like an aeroplane. Given a skilful pilot or driver, it will encompass the maximum of space in the minimum of time (and perhaps even the maximum of time in the minimum of space). We are said to be educated, yet we are never told—not even in the great Universities—the simplest elementary facts about our machines.

As for the pilot, well, he is only a labourer, worthy only of his hire. The less he knows about how to live, the more time he will have to labour. So that except for a few evolutionary or revolutionary æsthetes or scientists, he is a dumb innocent, strapped in his machine—as we see babies strapped in their prams. Our educational system goes one better than mother; it welds the pilot monobloc with his machine.

Yet the pilot or driver, the personality that uses the machine, is even more wonderful than his machine. The pilot even makes his own machine; but he, the pilot, grows—is created, not made. The old excuse that he was, like genius, born not made, will not serve; biology knows a lot about birth, in 1944. We can no longer plead innocence; we have knowledge now. To ignore knowledge is to be ignorant.

There is then the pilot and the machine; the personality and the physique. Society, by carefully designed education, turns the pilot into an automatic gyro-pilot, under distant wireless control; habits, conventions, fear, rites, ritual, *etc.*, controlled by authority.

But, before anybody else can make use of your physique, or

machine, he has got to knock out the pilot—with knock-out drops, with anæsthetics. He has, in fact, to get rid of your feelings—which are your personality. The first stage in anæsthesia is loss of feeling and loss of autonomy. This leaves the machine as a purely automatic engine, "George the mutt", in Air Force parlance.

This age we live in is called the Mechanical Age—the age of the machine. On the physical side, that is an accurate description. But, to the scientist who studies life—the biologist—it is the Anæsthetic Age. We are indeed facing an age when science has learned to use anæsthetics with great cunning and skill.

All our feelings are numb from the use of thousands of anæsthetics. It was found in one factory that 93 per cent of the females had a lipstick and a bottle of aspirin in their bags—the aspirin is to stop them struggling against the major anæsthetic of fatigue, just as the surgeon first dopes his patients so that they go under his major anæsthetic quietly, without struggle.

Yes, biologically speaking, this is the Age of Anæsthesia. Civilization is so addicted that most of our Artists and Æsthetes themselves are half-doped and dazzled by hypnotics—even these artist pilots with their very strong feelings succumb to the glittering lights of the mesmerists of Hollywood—they become purveyors of narcotic dreams.

So, now you see why it was necessary for scientists to examine, not only the machine, but the pilots—so that the pilots could know if they were fit to drive their machines. As long as the pilots knew what state they were in and what conditions their machines were in, that was all we scientists cared, because we wanted to see what the people were like, and, whatever they were like, what they did with themselves and their machines. When they got the chance, would they be able to transform that chance into opportunity? In physics, chance and opportunity are identical; they are statistical. Not so in biology.

Of course, the scientists always told the pilot all they discovered about the pilot and his machine. The pilot came to know, as well as the scientist, what he was like and what his machine was capable of. The scientist gave the pilot knowledge about himself and about his family and his home. Then the scientist turned him loose in the laboratory to do as he felt, when he felt like doing anything.

Most pilots, alas, had never even driven their own machines; they used to transport their machines to work, where the management jacked them up and used them to grind profits out of industry. By the evening the machines were so tired, so hot, and the oil so dirty and the petrol so low, that even if they wanted to run them on their own. they could not do so. Some pilots had been piloting tramcars and railway engines—their wheels were worn to flanges and could run only in tracks and tram-lines. When you told them

that they were also fitted with rubber tyres and that they could run free, they got the wind up—they had never done it before. But usually one of the young passengers used to encourage these old pilots to try. That is experimenting with freedom.

Naturally, most of the infants and children had not yet become dope fiends; their feelings were not yet anæsthetized. They were, in any case, never as bad as their parents. So it was always the young people, infants and children, who were first to start piloting their own machines about the laboratory, exercising their feelings, or personality, as well as their physique. They were wild and hysterical, as a rule, with excitement, for there was nobody there to say "Don't!", nobody there to say "Do be careful!", no policeman to take them across the roads in safety—there was not any "safety first" in the laboratory, no tram-lines on which to skid.

Do you remember those "bumping cars" you paid a shilling to ride in at Brighton, Margate, or Blackpool? Well, when the children got loose in the laboratory, they looked like that—four hundred of them piloting their own machines, often for the first time in their lives. Mother and father could not grasp the joy-stick, wheel, or handle-bars, or step on the brake, because the children were shut off from mother and father by glass walls. Parents could see what their children were doing but could not interfere, and the scientist would not interfere. Everybody, the youngest and the oldest, was free to follow his feelings—without interference—like the chicken in the egg-shell.

At first, parents used to watch their children with their hearts in their mouths—frightened for them. But, after watching the little pilots guiding their own machines, here, there, and everywhere, they were amazed to find that the children knew instinctively—like the chicken in the egg—how to pilot their machines, how to move about in a crowd without bumping anybody else. Amazingly skilful is the instinctive feeling of the children.

That gave the parents courage. So they started, carefully at first, to pilot their machines; to trust their feelings, likes, tastes, loves, to guide them through all the complicated crowd of 500 families using a laboratory full of things.

A little child shall lead them—that was true.

By the end of a year, what had the parents discovered? That they had tastes, feelings, æsthesia; and that their machines would go where they wanted them to go. They were free of the road, the social highway. They were all experimenting with living. They had recovered from the dope and had rediscovered their feelings—that they had personality and tastes of their own which they could exercise. They discovered for themselves the difference between exercism and exorcism.

So it was not the scientist, but the people who were experimenting. The people were experimenting with themselves. The scientist merely brooded, keeping the egg warm. Generally, as a matter of fact, he was just as busy experimenting with his own living—living is very, very infectious and contagious. Scientists and people were of the same boat's company.

Now, when we first started the experiment in living, we thought that the pilots would like to be *taught* how to drive their own machines. We thought that humans might be different from chickens in that they had to learn from somebody else how to grow out of their eggs. We should have known better, for Nature consistently sticks to her own laws.

Of course, when you think of it, it cannot be done, because there is in fact no room for an instructor in the car or the aeroplane—it is a single-seater machine that every pilot controls and directs. Nobody, whoever he is, can take the place of the pilot. And the pilot cannot be got out of the machine, even when he is doped.

Can you then learn from watching another fellow who can pilot his own machine? The chicken cannot, we know, because it has a shell. We cannot see the human shell, but does that mean that there is no shell enclosing personality? Is personality like an egg, a whole?

We did not know, so we tried having demonstrators, who could drive their own machines very well. That was a complete failure. Take the children, for example: we used to leave a demonstrator lying about doing his tricks—at first, the children were amused by him. A few, very few of them used to say: "How do you do that?" The demonstrator told them—he even drew a diagram on a blackboard with chalk, very simply and carefully. The children tried it on their machines, but it did not work. So at last the demonstrator interfered forcibly, most people say naturally, and took hold of the joy-stick of the child-machine—so that the child only had to pedal. The child pilot hated that—too much like school, they said. So the children very soon deserted the demonstrator. In fact, most of the children did not even look at the demonstrator, but started off on their own and soon were very pleased with themselves.

Why is this? Why do people hate to be taught to pilot their own machines?

The reason is that nobody can in fact teach us, because our own machine is a special model—every control is unique. There is no other machine like it. Not only that, but the pilot *builds his own machine* out of the material that father and mother provide—just like the chicken in the egg. No! our parents do not put in one single bolt or nut, any more than does the hen for the chick.

Parents supply the material and the fuel, but they cannot even fill our tanks or charge our batteries or knock a nut in. We, the pilots —we, personally, make our own machines. The design is the only one of its kind, it is unique. It is drawn up by father and mother, but we build it and we alone can pilot it through the world.

So the scientists got rid of all teachers and demonstrators and the people continued to teach themselves. In fact, pilots are just like seeds: put them in the soil, see that the soil is natural and not artificial, and the seeds grow—stalk, leaf, flower, and fruit—they grow and live on what they like and love. Just as you cannot crack an egg without killing the chicken—or pilot—so it is with the human egg. Cracked eggs *make* omelettes but do not *grow* hens.

You see then how free we had to leave the people and the families to follow their feelings—or æsthesia, or personality. Where did that lead to? To health, to a full life, full of people and things they loved.

What had the scientist discovered? A great many facts; but the most important of all is that wisdom grows out of innocence, when it is cultivated, and that the people are not ignorant—as innocent as you like, but not ignorant.

The important fact that emerges is that order and ease have laws of their own, that there is a science of ethology; just as disorder and disease have laws of their own—the science of pathology.

There is another, but incidental side to the experiment. When people recover from their dope or anæsthesia the first thing they want to do is to keep their machine in order. It often took weeks before the dope wore off, and a man discovered that his machine was interfering with the pilot's will to live. A man who had been going about with a bunion, flat foot, hernia, varicose veins, indigestion, bad teeth, defective vision, or cancer—in fact any of the thousands of disorders you can find in a medical textbook—wants, *the moment he is æsthetic,* to get rid of it, to put his machine in order, so as to liberate the pilot to do as he likes or loves.

So, as soon as the pilots were æsthetic, they used to come back to the scientist who had overhauled them and say: "How can I get repaired and made physically fit?"

The Peckham Laboratory was not a medical institution; it did not do repairs. Peckham was not a pathologist's workshop. Peckham was an ethologist's garden, or social allotment.

Hence, we had to fix the people up with a repair shop; we sent them to the "Medical Services". Then, when they came back, we overhauled them again to see if the job had been done properly.

For example, if a man had a hernia his truss was a nuisance, and if he went swimming his hernia hurt him. You might say that it must have hurt him while labouring. Perhaps it did, but

he was under anæsthesia, so hardly felt it. Being now æsthetic, up he came and asked us to fix up a repair job; we knew a good medical workshop better than he did. "Well", we said, "it will take three or four weeks, you know. Can you afford to lose the time? Will you lose your job if you are away four weeks? When is your holiday? You get two weeks—well, why not have it done then? If I write to your employer and tell him the arrangements you are going to make, will he help you?" Yes, the employer generally did, and even gave three weeks' holiday. So we made a date with the employer and with the special surgeon at the hospital, perhaps three or four months ahead, which makes it easier for the employer, the surgeon, and the hospital as well, and the job was done.

We overhauled the man when he came back. After some operations new disorders arise (for example, anæmia), so we had those put right and then gave the pilot the word "go" and told him what speed his machine could travel, so that he could keep a watch on himself till he could go all out. He could use the scientist's knowledge whenever he liked. In fact he used the pool of scientific knowledge just as he used the swimming-pool, whenever he felt like it.

That is but one example out of hundreds. If you are a member of the "Family Club", which is a "Health Centre", you don't need to wait till you are forced to go to a doctor. That saves everybody time, for a hernia when chronic becomes very difficult and dangerous to deal with and takes three months, not three weeks, for recovery.

So, while experimenting in living you safeguard yourself against dying—not because you are afraid of dying, but because you want to enjoy living. There is, in fact, no other safeguard, because only by experimental living can you find out your weaknesses and strengthen them in time.

Thus we are led to a new conclusion or hypothesis—that the desire to keep your machine in working order is proportionate to your desire to exercise your æsthesia—your personality—which is the body of your tastes, feelings, likes, and loves, your æsthetic body.

* * *

That brings us to the second rule of admission.

The families must feel at home in the Club. They must make it their own Club, by maintaining and sustaining it on their own responsibility.

Your house can belong to your landlord, but your hearth can only be your own. I have seen hovels with heavenly hearths. The hearth is the heart of your home—your home being your social allotment, your steading, where you cultivate and grow your personality.

That is why you carefully shut up your hearth in your house, just as Nature houses your heart inside your chest. The hearth is the centre of your organism—which is the family in its home.

That is the relation of your house to your hearth, and of your hearth to your home. As the heart is to your physique, so is your hearth to your home. Your house is merely the bony chest—a protecting shell.

Everybody told us that as scientists we were making a mistake in not going into the people's houses if we wanted to learn all about people. Now you see why we preferred to do as the doctor does—to put a stethoscope to the chest, the house, and listen from outside to the heart or hearth. We did not do a surgical operation and force our way into the chest to look at the heart; there is no need to do that except for artificial respiration in the moribund. Ethologists must consider the hearth as sacred or secret as the heart.

The hearth of the home is as full of love as the heart of your physique is full of blood. Love, like blood, can be poor, weak, watery stuff, or full, rich and high-coloured, with all kinds of tastes, feelings, likes—for love is a composite tissue of the personality. Tastes, feelings, likes, loves, have nothing whatsoever to do with any physical sensitivity—for, as I have said, the pilot or personality can be driving a very "insensitive" machine, or a highly sensitive machine may have an "unfeeling" anæsthetic pilot.

The hearth of your home must be as full of tastes, feelings, likes, loves, as your physical heart is full of blood. The hearth maintains the circulation of your æsthesia, your tastes and loves, through the body of the home.

To underline the significance of your personality, or æsthetic body, I would point out that "hearth disease", whose major symptom is homesickness, is a far far more serious and prevalent condition than heart disease. In the war it is affecting us all, not only the soldiers, sailors, and airmen. If you read the papers or ask the politicians, you would think we suffered from work disease or industrial disease, and were factory-sick. But they are quacks selling quack remedies in the market place; they are taking advantage of the fact that war shatters our feelings, so that we are anæsthetic.

How can you have feelings if you are anæsthetized? It does sound curious and contradictory, but the most excruciating agony and torture I have ever met is the total loss of feeling; ask a blind man who has lost his visual feeling what that anæsthesia feels like—it is the indescribable pain that numbs. A blind man can substitute all sorts of gadgets for the lost optic sensitivity of his machine; there is no substitution for the pilot's loss of visual taste, feeling, likes, love or æsthesia. So, you see, the most excruciating torture

is total anæsthesia, and we cannot fight wars without anæsthesia—we have to kill without feeling. No, it is not the physical injury of war that matters; it is the injury to the personality, or æsthetic body. To the Home.

How do you define a "home"? The home is defined and delimitated by the social excursion of the family and its members; not by the spatial excursion or the temporal excursion—they do not count—but the social excursion in society.

The home then is an area of the body of society, marked out by your family's social excursion. It is the *ethos*—a sort of social ether, or socioplasm, whereby tastes, feelings, likes, loves, are transmitted and transported.

If you cannot exercise your tastes, feelings, likes, loves beyond the doorstep of your house, they atrophy instead of grow. You become more and more anæsthetic. Your æsthesia, or personality, needs social soil for the spread of its roots, and social atmosphere for the spread of its branches. That is what the Health Centre at Peckham provided for its member-families—a wide area of cultivated nutrient so that the personality, or æsthetic body—the "pilot"—could grow. Man, in fact, cannot live by bread alone; and his æsthetic diet, food for his tastes, feelings, likes and loves, has—like bread—to be sown, grown, and cultivated.

GODWARD ASPECT AND SACRIFICE

By William E. Wilson, B.D.

The recent works of two leading theologians on the atonement demand a clarification of our ideas on two closely related questions: (*a*) Had the death of Christ and His whole saving activity a "Godward aspect"? (*b*) What out of all the ideas involved in, or associated with, sacrifice, is meant by the sacrificial terminology so frequently used in the *N.T.* about the death of Christ? Is it simply one of the old ideas? If so, which one—or ones? Or is it, what would surely be fitting, a new idea, subversive, or at least transformative, of what had gone before?

I. These two scholars, Dr. Vincent Taylor and Dr. Wheeler Robinson, have both explicitly repudiated the theories of satisfaction and penal atonement so long dominant in the theology of all sections of the Christian Church in the West. As the purpose of this paper necessitates some criticism of certain statements of both these authors, it seems important at once to emphasize the present writer's great appreciation of both works (for Dr. Vincent Taylor's three books are really one work) and his almost complete agreement with the view of our Lord's work expressed by both, apart from the two questions with which we shall be concerned.

Each of Dr. Taylor's three volumes investigates one part of the *N.T.* testimony on the Atonement. The first, *Jesus and His Sacrifice,* after a preliminary consideration of the *O.T.* background, deals with our Lord's own words respecting his death; the second, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching,* deals comprehensively and in detail with all that *N.T.* writers say about it; and the third, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation,* has as its subject what they say of the appropriation of the work of Christ by the believer and the transformation wrought in him by it. The whole work is the most thorough and searching investigation of Scriptural teaching on the atonement that has yet appeared. It is a notable fact therefore that in each volume Dr. Taylor asserts that satisfaction and penal substitution doctrines of the atonement have no basis in the passages discussed. This, in the face of the attempt by the Barthians and others to reintroduce these doctrines, is most salutary.

Dr. Wheeler Robinson's work is not so much an exposition of Scripture as a theological treatise. Its title, *Redemption and Revelation,* sufficiently indicates its scope. He too, in a more general way, repudiates satisfaction and penal substitution doctrines, but regards them as metaphorical ideas which may, rightly

understood, still serve a useful purpose—a point to which we must return. Perhaps the greatest, as certainly the most pervasive, of the many excellencies of this book is that Dr. Wheeler Robinson sees Redemption and Revelation not as separable entities, but as closely knit together, in fact as one. And for him Redemption is the fuller and more inclusive term, for it represents the aim and achievement of which Revelation is the means. Thus the Redemption in Christ is both the climax of Revelation and the purpose which always lay within it. I believe that it is this steady viewing of Redemption as the whole of which Revelation is a part which is the strongest foundation of what to me is one of the most notable and important of his considered judgments, namely, his uncompromising Patri-passianism. That doctrine, condemned as heresy in the early Church, must now come to its own and be recognized, not merely as true but as the deepest truth of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Of course Dr. Robinson's Patripassianism is not the modalism of Sabellius—a sort of one-at-a-time theory of the Trinity. Nor can it be identified with the crude statement attributed to Praxeas, that the Father was crucified. His Patripassianism is rather the assertion that God suffers in the sin of His creatures, a doctrine amply supported by Scripture, and only denied on the basis of ideas derived from Greek thinking.

Very similar is Dr. Vincent Taylor's insistence in several places that the atonement is the work of God, and that we must never in thought separate God and Christ in it (*Atonement*, pp. 110, 205), and again that there is no opposition between righteousness and love (*op. cit.*, p. 112). Thus it will be realized that these two works are most heartily welcome to an uncompromising opponent of satisfactionism and a convinced follower of Abelard and the great tradition which he represents.

II. Yet in both these writers there is more than a hint that the satisfaction idea has not quite lost its hold upon them. This is indicated in Dr. Taylor's insistence that the death of Christ has a "Godward Aspect", as well as in his attempt to sum up the work of Christ under the category of sacrifice, and in Dr. Robinson's expressed desire to retain in some metaphorical sense the ideas of "satisfaction" and "penalty".

It would appear then that while seeing the work of Christ explicitly as God's work through Him and emphatically denying "transactional" doctrines of atonement, both these authors still feel it necessary to believe that in some way Christ by dying on the Cross acted upon or influenced God. I assume that the term "Godward aspect" is intended to indicate this, for it cannot rightly be applied to two obviously true and necessary ideas involved in the atonement—our Lord's entire unity with God's will in dying,

and the result of His death in turning men to God. These two ideas are essential to any theory of atonement, but neither is a Godward aspect of the work of Christ. The first is rather the necessary pre-condition of Christ's saving work than a part of its action; it is simply another way of saying that the atonement is God's work through Christ. It is not an action by Christ on God, but rather Christ's complete association of Himself with the Father's purpose to save men. And it does not explain why that purpose involved the Cross. Similarly the second contains no necessary hint of any work wrought on God. It was God's work, done by Christ. It results in a Godward movement in men; it has as its pre-condition a movement from God through Christ to men, and nothing on the part of Christ that can be called a Godward aspect. I stress these points because on this subject there is a strong tendency to argue in a circle, and thus find support for a Godward aspect in facts which looked at squarely have no such implication.

We are then bound to take "Godward aspect", when used of the work of Christ, as meaning that that work was, not simply God's work, done for Him, but also in some way done to Him. I think both our authors mean this. I ask, therefore, is it possible to take this view without holding a satisfaction view of the atonement? I think it is not, for the essence of all satisfaction ideas is that Christ in His death offered something to God on man's behalf. In this sense McLeod Campbell and Moberly were satisfactionists, as is Dr. Vincent Taylor when he finds two elements in Christ's sacrifice to be "His perfect subjection to God's judgement on sin" and "His perfect penitence for the sins of men". The first is McLeod Campbell's view, the second Moberly's. But is there any Scripture authority for either? What authority has the satisfaction idea at all? It has no place in Scripture. It has none in early Patristic times. It has tended to obscure for multitudes of people the two most important facts of life, the awfulness of men's sin and the depth and intensity of the saving love of God.

III. There can I think be little doubt that the frequent use in the *N.T.* of sacrificial terminology when speaking of the death of Christ, and the use of such words as "redemption" and "ransom" as synonyms for the salvation which is its result, together form the chief basis for this "Godward aspect" conception. We will consider the latter first. Dr. Wheeler Robinson says

> "ransom" expresses the cost of the actuality of redemption wrought by Christ, and points upward to the eternal cost of divine forgiveness.

This is true. But when it is associated, as it seems to be in his mind, with "sacrifice" and "satisfaction", it is all too easy to slip into the Anselmic error of regarding the "cost" as paid to God.

And this may lead on, as it did in the history of the doctrine, to the idea of a "penalty" paid on man's behalf by Christ to God—conceptions which both he and Dr. Taylor repudiate. The fact is that while both "ransom" and "redemption" imply "cost", the chief thing for which they stand is "liberation" or "emancipation".

It is not necessary here to repeat the investigation of this subject in the *O.T.* which I published in *The Problem of the Cross*. It is enough to mention that when used, as they frequently are used (especially "redemption"; "ransom" is not much used) of the relation of God to His people, they always mean simply "rescue", "liberation", "emancipation" and nothing more. And that is always their meaning in the *N.T.* The "Godward aspect" has only been read into them by the literalist assumption that something parallel to, if not identical with, an actual purchase is meant. And thus has arisen the idea that Christ purchased our salvation from God, an idea which in most cases is entirely precluded by a study of the context.

Turning now to "sacrifice", a term strongly insisted upon by both our authors, Dr. Wheeler Robinson says

> "sacrifice" extends [the thought expressed by "ransom"] by making the death of Christ an actual offering to God, something that has unique worth for Him, by which the penitent sinner is emboldened to approach Him, in the faith that this offering has become his own.

The words are full of deep religious feeling. They express how many thousands of devout souls have regarded the sacrifice of Christ. It is therefore a painful task to criticize them. But in the interests of truth it must be done. How could the death of the Incarnate Son be of unique worth to His Father except in the negative sense of being a unique cost, a unique injury? It was the most overwhelming instance of men's sin, and as such not a sacrifice to God, but the greatest insult and injury ever offered to Him. Christ's death, as such, could not be any benefit to God. Its only benefit to Him must lie in what it achieved, man's redemption. God, we believe, with His suffering servant, will "see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied". But His satisfaction in the death of Christ can only be in what it achieves. It cannot therefore achieve it by causing Him satisfaction. That is to say, the word "sacrifice", if thereby is meant Christ's sacrifice to God, does not explain or begin to explain how the death of Christ is the foundation of redemption.

To turn to Dr. Taylor. In *Jesus and His Sacrifice* he suggests three meanings in the self-offering of Jesus: (1) His perfect obedience to the Father's Will; (2) His perfect subjection to God's judgment upon sin; (3) His perfect penitence for the sins of men.

I have already pointed out that there is no *N.T.* foundation for

the second and third. So we are left with the simple equation: Christ's sacrifice equals His perfect obedience to the Will of God. Is that the complete truth or is there more in it? That it is part of the truth there can be no doubt. Where in the *N.T.* sacrifice is mentioned, this is in at least some cases the meaning of the expression. *Heb.* 10^{5-10}, *e.g.*, seems to equate the sacrifice of Christ with dedication to the will of God, and sees His death as the outcome of that will, and as the means by which a like dedication to God can be produced in the believer. Similarly in *Eph.* 5^{2}, where Paul speaks of the death of Christ for us as "an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell", it seems probable that the reference is to His dedication of will. For what can be more acceptable to God than dedication to His will? And in what can Christ be more fully an example? The sacrifice of Christ then is dedication to the will of God. That seems to be its meaning in these two passages, and possibly in others. That will required His death on the cross. But to discover how Christ's death saves men, to gain, if not a theory, at least a working view of the atonement, we require some other ground for its necessity, otherwise we are simply arguing in a circle thus—

Question: Why did God require the death of Christ?
Answer: Because it was necessary.

Question: Why was it necessary?
Answer: Because God required it.

If we attempt to get out of the circle on the "Godward" side we are bound to posit as the source of the necessity that the Divine Justice or honour (as in Anselm) would not allow free forgiveness of the repentant sinner. And then we are back at the satisfaction doctrine which both our authors repudiate. Further, we are implicitly stating that the many *O.T.* assertions of the free and abundant forgiveness of God are mistaken, and that Jesus Himself was hiding a part of the truth in proclaiming free forgiveness without any reference to His approaching death.

Here I must again refer to Dr. Wheeler Robinson's view that such terms as "satisfaction" and "penalty", along with "ransom" and "sacrifice", may still be used by us as metaphorical expressions. I believe this to be true of "ransom" and "sacrifice", which are terms used in the *N.T.* When we gain a true view of their meaning there, as I have already indicated as regards "ransom", and hope to indicate as regards "sacrifice", we can still use them and in part grasp and approve their admittedly metaphorical meaning. But "satisfaction" and "penalty" stand on a different footing. They are not *N.T.* terms. They arose comparatively late in the development of the doctrine. Moreover, that development was not a fairly consistent development in a

straight line, with additions and modifications made to bar the way to heresy, as was the development of Christology. On the contrary, Anselm is a denial of Irenaeus; and the greater part of modern attempts at formulation are denials of Anselm, and of the developments from his doctrine which have for so long dominated both Catholic and Protestant theology.

Is it not time to admit that the doctrine of Anselm and its derivatives are heresy—heresy developed in good faith (as were many heresies) by a saint and thinker of the first order, but heresy none the less? It is both truer and safer to reject and forget the terminology of such a heresy than to attempt to retain it while transforming its meaning.

IV. The other side of the thought of sacrifice in the *N.T.* is one that, so far as I know, has not been grasped, yet it is there; it is that *Christ's death was a sacrifice offered by God to men.* This seems to be the intended implication of the words of Jesus recorded in *Mk.* $14^{23, 24}$, when He gave the cup to His disciples and said, "This is my blood of the Covenant which is shed for many".

In commenting on these words in *Jesus and His Sacrifice* Dr. Taylor mentions that two Jewish scholars, Drs. Montefiore and Klausner, both point out that the idea of drinking blood, even symbolically, would to any Palestinian Jew of the first century have been absolutely repulsive, and both conclude that Jesus cannot have said these words. To this Dr. Taylor truly answers that Jesus said many things that were most distasteful to Palestinian Jews, and suggests that the very fact that these words would be repulsive to Palestinian Jews shows that they must have come from our Lord Himself, and are not an addition by the compilers of the Gospels. We must go further than this; we must admit that Jesus, being Himself a Palestinian Jew, must have fully realized how repulsive these words would be to His fellow Jews, and that therefore He could not possibly have used them unless He had meant to say something which was absolutely necessary and of extraordinary importance. What this was we may gather from the consideration of the reason why the drinking of blood seemed not merely repulsive but impious to the Jew. Throughout the Law the blood of the sacrificial victim was always regarded as the vital principle and therefore as God's portion of the sacrifice, never to be consumed by men. If then Jesus insisted that the symbol of the blood be drunk by His disciples He was indeed—as Dr. Taylor says—speaking of Himself in sacrificial language; but he was doing more, he was saying almost in so many words, that His was a sacrifice given by God to men, not by men to God: *the words in fact seem deliberately intended to reverse the whole idea of sacrifice.* If then we are, as Dr. Taylor desires, to take sacrifice as the chief category

by which the meaning of the atonement can be expressed, we shall miss the point unless we realize that it is a sacrifice given by God to men, and not a sacrifice given by men to God.

The question now arises: how far, if at all, did the *N.T.* writers grasp our Lord's great reversal of the common principle of sacrificial religion? The first answer to this question is general—with one accord they see the work of Christ as God's work, through Him for man's salvation. This is so pervasive of the whole *N.T.* that it is not necessary to quote verses.

More specifically there are at least two passages which seem to be specially designed to emphasize God's sacrifice to men, though, so far as I know, no *N.T.* scholar has pointed this out. In *Rom.* $3^{24, 25}$ there are words which seem to be specially intended to bear this meaning:

> Being justified freely by His (God's) grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood to show his righteousness.

Here it is said that God set forth Christ as a *Hilasterion* (the Greek represented by our word "propitiation"). Much discussion has taken place over the exact meaning of this word. It is certainly connected with sacrificial worship, and may possibly mean a sacrifice the object of which is to bring unity between God and man. But the point of the passage is that God set it forth; in other words, what the Apostle here was trying to say was not something suggesting a satisfaction or penal substitution view of the work of Christ, but that God sacrificed to men—the sacrifice was reversed, God to men, not men to God. The introductory words "freely" and "by His grace" point in the same direction, and the statement in verse 21, that the whole thing is apart from the Law, might be taken as a suggestion that Paul realized how subversive his view was of the whole *O.T.* sacrificial system.

Jn. 1^{29} ("Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world") we may take as the Evangelist's interpretation of John the Baptist's recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. But the phrase "Lamb of God" is peculiar. Why the genitive "of God"? Neither the Passover lamb nor a sacrificial lamb, nor the lamb of *Isa.* 53, is referred to in the *O.T.* as "of God". Spitta maintains with some probability that the words are not intended to denote a sacrificial lamb at all, but refer back to some of the Apocalypses in which the people of Israel figure as a flock of sheep and the Messiah as a ram leading them[1].

Even so "of God", while possible, scarcely seems needed. But if the Evangelist meant a sacrificial lamb given not by men to God,

[1] *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen, 1907). In *The Problem of the Cross* I adopted this view. It certainly fits the Lamb Messiah of *Rev.* Now I think the interpretation here given more adequate for *Jn.*

but by God to men, could he more briefly and pointedly say it than by calling Jesus the Lamb of God? If that is his meaning—and no more convincing explanation of the remarkable use of the genitive, the case of origin, has been suggested—there can be very little doubt that he wanted to make clear what the whole of his Gospel, and especially 3^{15-21}, confirms, that the salvation of men was wholly the work of God through His only begotten Son. And that he did this by reversing the whole idea of sacrifice. In the climax of revelation which is redemption, God does not receive the sacrifice from men. He gives it to them. Christ is a sacrifice, yet not the culminating sacrifice of men to God, but rather God's sacrifice to men. If these three passages, containing the words of Jesus Himself and of His two greatest interpreters, are thus rightly understood, it is possible that many of the references throughout the *N.T.* to Jesus in sacrificial language do not refer to Him as a sacrifice presented to God, but to God's presentation of Him to men.

V. It may be felt that what I have tried to say is too revolutionary, and I conceive it possible that some will regard it as the height of unorthodoxy, and even perhaps as blasphemy. I would therefore point out that this thought of God sacrificing for man is the essence of the Christian message. It is congruent with the constant tracing of salvation to God by the *N.T.* writers, and with the general biblical insistence on the divine initiative; it is also congruent with the fact of our Lord's mission and passion, where it is obvious that God gave Christ to men and that it was men who rejected and killed Him. This is testified in a number of *N.T.* passages. In the record of our Lord's own words in the Parable of the Vineyard—the son is sent last, with the words, "They will reverence my son". In the early apostolic preaching recorded in *Acts* we have the statement, "Him being delivered up by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye by the hands of lawless men did crucify and slay". In both the suggestion is strong that the giving of Christ was God's side of what happened, and the death of Christ was caused by men's rejection of that gift.

Lastly, does not this idea fit the fundamental facts of man and his sin? We usually think of sin as evil acts and evil thoughts; but they are the symptoms rather than the disease. That lies deeper. It is the rejection of God's will, of God's guidance and God's power. Man in his pride desires the impossible—to be independent of God. The atonement is God's answer to men's sin. In the satisfaction and penal substitution development of that doctrine, God's answer has strangely been interpreted as something done to Himself or to the eternal law of justice. But that is arguing to the wrong end. The thing that was wrong was man's rejection of God. It can only be put right as man accepts God, goes back to Him. Thus the

testimony of the *N.T.* is that the purpose of Christ's coming and giving Himself to men was to bring them back to the Father.

The amazing wonder of it is that God humbles Himself to beseech men to return to Him, and is willing to run the risk of the rejection of His gift, a rejection that actually takes place.

I have said that the view here put forward may be regarded as unorthodox or blasphemous. But this is not in the least because it is so, but only because in theological controversy the strange, unusual, or subversive view is almost always so regarded at first. Actually, it is the satisfaction and penal substitution views of the atonement that are unorthodox, for they have been a continual strain on orthodox trinitarian convictions, because in them lay inherent a tendency to oppose God and Christ. That same tendency must lie in any "Godward aspect", if by that phrase is meant, as seems to be meant, that in His death Christ in some way acted upon God. Why should we ever suppose that there need be any Godward aspect in the cross? Is not all from God? Why cannot we be willing to receive our salvation as an absolutely free gift from God? We may and must regard it with undying wonder. "Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift", ought to be our constant thought. But our "wonder, love, and praise" are not increased when we are told that in some undefined way Christ worked upon God to cause Him to save us. This produces puzzlement and doubt rather than praise. Why not accept Jesus and His cross in the obvious meaning they bear as facts of history? Jesus comes to men as God's messenger and message: men welcome Him with the cross. What could more clearly show the goodness of God and the sin of man? And the sin and resistance of men serve as the measure of God's love. That the Almighty should love mankind may seem natural to us nowadays. It never seems to have been thought natural by anyone before Jesus came. But that the Very God of Very God should love men sufficiently to persevere in showing love to men when faced with the cross is something that no man could have dreamed of. Were it not a sober fact of history we should declare it incredible. The love of God in Jesus is incredible, and so it wins our faith. But it is *all* God to man: none of it is man to God until it arouses that response of faith.

All primitive religion, all the great systems of sacrifice, are man's attempt to win salvation for himself by sacrifice. He gives to God: then God *may* give to him. It is simply human and filled with pride. The reality—partly anticipated in the prophets—is seen in Christ. He is the one and only effective sacrifice, but He is God's gift, His sacrifice to men, not theirs to Him. All they can do is to accept Him, and their acceptance involves giving themselves, living sacrifices, to God.

GLADSTONE'S IMAGERY

By Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D.

Gladstone's voluminous writings are but rarely read in these days. They enjoyed a great vogue in the second half of last century, when his power and fame rose steadily to their zenith, but they have shared in the eclipse which his reputation has experienced. At the beginning of the present century his name was a household word, not only in the remotest parts of Great Britain and Ireland, but also in the capitals of Europe and on the American continent. The publication of Morley's great biography was one of the literary sensations of the beginning of this century. Less and less attention has been paid to him in its successive decades, although there seem to be symptoms of recurring interest in a national figure whom Balfour described as the greatest member of the greatest deliberative assembly that the world has ever seen. Such a turn of the tide must come sooner or later, for Gladstone has claims on the remembrance of posterity which cannot be denied. It may well be that he was somewhat overrated by his contemporaries, but he is not isolated in that respect any more than the many prophets who are not without honour save in their own day and generation. It is most unlikely, however, that his publications will ever regain any measure of popularity, even although they range over a great variety of subjects, as one might expect from the discursive and encyclopedic nature of Gladstone's mentality. Thus he wrote on Homer in a fashion which earned the commendation of Sir Richard Jebb, the great Graecist. Macaulay has immortalized his first book dealing with the relations of Church and State in a trenchant essay. His contributions to learned periodicals occupy eight volumes, whose small size are apt to mislead the reader as to their real bulk in reading matter. He also published an edition of Bishop Butler's *Works* with a volume of papers on theological themes suggested by the *Analogy* and *Sermons* of the famous eighteenth century divine. Indeed Morley's remark with regard to his general versatility, to the effect that no living man ever tried to ride so many horses abreast, applies with equal force to what he wrote.

Nothing of this oceanic output will live. It has been well said of him that he wrote too fast and too often, but unlike Sir Walter Scott, who did the same but with vastly different results. His literary work will, however, repay in some measure the student who is disposed to dip into it; and that in two ways. He will become wearied as he traverses the wilderness of words, but ever and anon his flagging interest will be stimulated by some sentence

instinct with the sagacity which gave Gladstone the place which he enjoys amongst European statesmen, or by some flash of imagery which is as welcome as a shaft of sunlight on a wet day. Here are some examples of the former. Of the British Constitution he writes, "Time was its parent; Silence was its nurse". The same hand also wrote these suggestive words, "The charioteer, and the woodman, for both of whom, says the Poet, as well as for the pilot, skill avails far more than force". And yet again he says of Milton that "Nowhere is he more a Poet, whether for music or for majesty, than in his prose". Similar aphorisms appear in every half-dozen pages or less.

But our present concern is with his imagery. It usually takes the form of similes; these rarely exceed a phrase or a clause in length, although the analogy is occasionally elaborated. These pictorial and poetic touches are so numerous and so admirable that they constitute a distinctive feature of Gladstone's literary style. Many writers use them, but not with the aptness and freshness which characterize Gladstone's analogies. He evidently took pleasure in these embellishments for he specially commends Homer, Bishop Butler, and Tennyson for the same features, and, just as we are prone to condemn in others our own failings, so we tend to commend in others our own excellencies. There can be no doubt that, as a writer, Gladstone excelled in these figurative touches, as the instances which will now be cited abundantly prove. It should be noted that almost all the examples are similes rather than metaphors.

They may best be classified according as they illustrate more or less vividly three characteristics of his imagery—its simplicity, its freshness, and its felicity. Commencing with the first of these, it is all the more striking because of Gladstone's reading. Of that no more need be said than to quote the observation that, if Lord Acton, whose omnivorous devouring of books is so justly famous, was a *gourmet,* Gladstone was a *gourmand.* In these circumstances, one would have expected his similes to exhibit the fruits of excursions so wide and varied, but the very reverse is the case. Many of the similes would seem to be within the range of the average villager. That observation leads to another to the effect that, although Gladstone was a townsman born and bred, his illustrations are often taken from rural life. For instance, eulogizing Queen Victoria and the immensely stable institution of the British monarchy, he says, "Parliaments and Ministers pass, but she abides in life-long duty; and she is to them as the oak in the forest is to the annual harvest in the field". That is simplicity itself, and yet none can deny its effectiveness. As an enthusiastic woodman, it is only to be expected that he should have recourse to his favourite outdoor pastime in such comparisons as these. He refers to

"some strong oak that the lightning fails to rive" and to the Church, like "an oak unfolding the life which it has carried seminally within it from the acorn". These latter are rather commonplace, but here is a more unusual use of arboriculture:

> Now if it be true that these miracles are anomalies in nature, it may be that there exist, although at present hidden from us, good reasons for such anomalies in the importance of the purpose which may be served by them. I have often observed in woodcutting that when a tree threw out near the ground beginnings of roots unusually large, this was a cautionary provision made by nature to compensate, by an outward projection of unusual strength, for the weakness produced by some rot latent in the interior trunk.

Incidentally these two sentences will serve to illustrate Disraeli's famous gibe that his great rival was intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.

Fine simplicity appears again in the claim he makes for the reasoning of Bishop Butler, the idol of his declining years: a bad argument is as rare in Butler's chapters as a black swan. Of the theological thinking of Mrs. Annie Besant he writes:

> Mrs. Besant passes from her earliest to her latest stage of thought as lightly as the swallow skims the surface of the lawn, and with just as little effort to ascertain what lies beneath it.

That is hard hitting but it throws into still stronger relief the sincerity of this noble tribute to the Prince Consort, distinguished by another simile, as simple as it is eloquent:

> As a watch wound up obeys its mainspring until it has all run out, so he, at all moments, seemed to be answering the call of an inward voice, summoning him to learn, to think, to do, to bear.

Referring to a very different personage, the King of Naples, he thus expresses himself with reference to grave mistakes of policy:

> Had the King in 1848 been advised to encounter his difficulties with "those small stones from the brook", frankness, steadiness, and singleness of purpose, events would have turned out differently.

The simplicity of the Biblical imagery is there utilized to good purpose. References to Naples furnish another instance as striking as it is short and simple: "There is no marvel in Naples without a sister to it".

Not only is this wealth of imagery characterized by that simplicity which is at the farthest remove from all that is shallow or obvious; the freshness of these parallels arrest the reader again and again. There is nothing hackneyed about them, any more than there is about the simple imagery of the Fourth Gospel with

its references to light and bread, sheep and doors, as symbols of the highest and deepest things ever revealed to man. Thus the usual emblem of trepidation is the aspen leaf. Gladstone finds another analogy. Writing of the inmates of Neapolitan gaols whose condition roused his chivalrous indignation, as the cause of the oppressed so often did, he says:

> Several of them were in prison when I was at Naples; others not in actual confinement, but trembling as a hare trembles, at every whisper of the wind.

There is surely a touch of true poetry in the last few words. It is customary to use the shadow of a man as symbolic of something or somebody who dogs his steps wherever he may go. Gladstone seems to improve on that with the following. Dealing with the Homeric similes, he observes, "There is in them the same elasticity and variety, as in the thought and the style: thus they follow over hill and dales as the faithful dog follows the step of his master". A similar freshness is manifest in this figure, employed to defend comprehensiveness so wide as to be in danger of becoming meaningless: "But, as when the net of the fisherman is cast wide, its extremity must lie far from his hand". Anybody can understand and appreciate that, but it took a Gladstone to discover it.

He has been criticized for his lack of humour. He was too much in earnest. That is true of his speeches and writing, but not of his private life. In society, as well as in his home, he was the most cheerful of men, and, if he did not break many jests, he could laugh loud and long at a witticism. That makes two examples which are as fresh as those just cited doubly interesting, for they seem to have a flavouring of wit. Writing of the qualities and qualifications necessary for Cabinet Ministers, he observes,

> There have been honourable and distinguished exceptions; but, as a rule, it would be as rational to begin training for the ballet at forty-five or fifty, as for the real testing work of the Cabinet.

Sarcasm often savours of humour, and here is an instance in which that blending appears:

> And our Constitution, so often destroyed by rash and profane hands, with its nine, or ninety times nine, catlike lives, will still be for the Mr. Lowe of that day, the Constitution which has been the admiration of the world for five hundred years.

The comparison of the British Constitution in its vicissitudes to the proverbial cat with nine lives is surely as wise as it is witty. Can the same be said of this castigation of Lord Macaulay? Whether true or not, it is impossible for any student of the great Whig historian and essayist to read this imagery without a smile. It is both fresh and funny:

> The truth is that Macaulay was not only accustomed, like many more of us, to go out hobby-riding, but from the portentous vigour of the animal he mounted, was liable, more than most of us, to be run away with. His merit is that he could keep his seat in the wildest steeplechase; but, as the object in view is arbitrarily chosen, so it is reached by cutting up the fields, spoiling the crops, and spoiling or breaking down the fences needful to secure for labour its profit, and to man at large the full enjoyment of the fruit of the earth.

Felicity is the highest praise of all. A simile may be simple and fresh, and yet it may fail in that happy precision which is like hitting the nail on the head. It has been said that there is an absolutely adequate analogy for almost everything, comparable to Wordsworth's swan on St. Mary's, floating double "swan and shadow". The Book of Proverbs abounds in illustrations: "As he that taketh away a garment in cold weather, and as vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart". It would be absurd to claim for Gladstone that he often succeeds in achieving such fine felicity in his similes, but there are occasions when he does seem to be very happy. Let us commence with a whimsical instance. Alluding to a political contemporary, he remarks that this individual was as helpless in defence as a beetle on its back. Entomologists would doubtless endorse the accuracy and aptness of the similitude. Much more effective because so easily verified is his comparison of the Church in its modifications of its belief and behaviour to a ship riding at anchor: "A ship retains her anchorage yet drifts within a certain range, subject to the wind and tide". That is admirably put as illustrating the essential steadfastness of Christianity in the maintenance of its characteristic doctrines and practices, while compelled to acknowledge that time has wrought many and divers changes. Even better is this analogy used to illustrate an aspect of Homer:

> This sentiment is conveyed by Homer in a multitude of slight and fine shadings of expression like that insensible action of the hand in driving which keeps a straight instead of a fluctuating line.

Gladstone never surpassed that. It is doubtful if he ever equalled it, especially in view of the fact that motoring which was, of course, unknown in his day, has given to the comparison new force and meaning. This image is singularly felicitous.

To correct a possible misapprehension that Gladstone's imagery was always of the simple and straightforward type illustrated again and again in the preceding examples, it is of interest to turn to some cases where the felicity is combined with a greater degree of subtlety. Thus there is a world of significance in this reference to the luxuries of civilization as enjoyed by the moneyed

class in contrast with the poor. The words were written in the latter part of last century when conditions in town and country alike were very different indeed from what they are now. With reference, then, to many amenities of life, or superfluities, as he calls them, he observes, "These superfluities are like the threads which bound down Gulliver to the soil". There surely we may hear the authentic voice of the champion of the proletariat. It sounds more clearly and boldly in another comparison:

> As the barbarian, with his undeveloped organ, sees and hears at distances which the senses of the cultured state cannot overpass, and yet is utterly deficient as to finer details of sound and colour, even so it seems that, in judging of the great questions of policy which appeal to the primal truths and laws of our nature, these classes may excel, who, if they lack the opportunities, yet escape the subtle perils of the wealthy state.

There is a defence of democratic government illustrated by a remarkably fresh and felicitous parallel. In every phase of human life and work, many things tend to be hidden from the wise and prudent and to be patent to those who are but babes in wisdom and knowledge.

Normally Gladstone's imagery is of the more simple type, although never wanting in that sense of felicity which is the very savour of simile. To take an illustration which must be read in the light of the violent Romish polemics so characteristic of the nineteenth century, here is what he has to say on the claims of the Papacy in the field of Christian doctrine:

> To the common eye it seems as if many articles of Christian belief had at first been written in invisible ink; and as if the Pope alone assumed the office of putting the paper to the fire; and exhibiting those novel antiquities to the gaze of an admiring world.

Setting aside all partisan questions, it must be admitted that the comparison is a clever one, as may easily be discovered if an attempt be made to find anything half as effective.

Usually these similes are so adequate that one is sufficient. That lends all the more interest to a passage in which three appear. Discussing the nation-wide influence of the Court in the Victorian Age, he observes:

> Of the planets which wheel round the sun some are themselves wheeled round by other and secondary stars. The Court touched, in the strictest sense, only the select men of the country; but of these every one was himself a centre of influence by example, by exertion, by mental activity, it might be by all combined; and each transmitted what he had delivered, as one billiard ball carries on the stroke to another, or as the circles widen on the water.

A threefold cord is not quickly broken, and these three analogies in their simplicity, freshness, and felicity should serve to bind more firmly to the altar of service and sacrifice the man or woman who has come under the influence of that court of the immortals which every university and college ought to constitute.

In a closing sentence it may be suggested that Gladstone's gift for imagery was due to the Highland blood in his veins which he derived from his mother:

> Sir John Gladstone was a pure Scotsman, a Lowlander by birth and descent. He married Anne, daughter of Andrew Robertson, of Stornoway, belonging to the clan Donachie, and by this marriage the robust and businesslike qualities of the Lowlander were blended with the poetic imagination, the sensibility and fire of the Gael.

It may truly be said that these contrasted groups of qualities manifest themselves in Gladstone's imagery as clearly as in every other side of his many-sided career.

THE RECOVERY OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

By the Rev. G. C. EDMONDS, M.A.

IN *Christian Worship: Decline and Recovery,* a pamphlet well worth study, we read[1]:

> We cannot escape from the fact that Christian worship has lost its hold on the great mass of our people. Even those who are regular in its practice find it sometimes flat and unprofitable. . . . The background of this slump in the appreciation of Christian worship is the widespread inability of folk today to realise just where God is to be found in their own world of experience. This applies most of all to those who have let slip the Christian tradition. . . . But it applies also, in some measure, to those who have kept the tradition of Church-going without ever being deeply stirred by it to joy or wonder. There is much in the conduct and setting of our services which would not be tolerated if this were not so.

These notes are offered in the conviction that there is no single and no easy road to the recovery of our worship.

The Structure of Worship.

Where there is no vision of God, there can be no real worship: but this does not mean that form is unimportant. Our new Reformers do us good service in reminding us that there is a structure of Christian worship given in the Gospel. Each full act of Christian worship should set forth the whole Gospel of the Incarnate, Crucified and Risen Lord, and the Church's whole response of adoration, thanksgiving, confession, and petition. This emphasis is right and good, and still much needed: much discussion of worship moves on the level of expediency only. Our business is to declare the whole Gospel and to make the whole response; and we should be taught to think of our services in that light, and of each particular item or significant action in them in relation to the Gospel.

Moreover, we are rightly reminded of the value of forms of worship in setting before us the whole faith—that Christian Faith which is what it is, and not our opinions, and which is far greater than our individual apprehensions of it. Dr. Niebuhr is said to have commented on Anglican Services that much of the preaching was Pelagian, but the liturgy was soundly Augustinian: and Mr. Bernard Manning has shown[2] how, amidst the vagaries of the 18th century, the liturgy of Congregationalism, meaning in particular the hymns of Dr. Watts, kept the worshippers in the catholic and evangelical faith.

[1] Issued by the Free Church Fellowship, obtainable from Indep. Press (3d.).
[2] *Essays in Orthodox Dissent,* 188.

But the principle must not be pedantically applied. If we are going back to the *N.T.*, we must not underestimate the classic picture of Christian worship given there in *1 Cor.* 14—a picture of an extremely informal, spontaneous, spirit-moved worship. Whenever the Spirit has touched the life of the Churches that free spontaneous worship has reappeared. When the Church settles down, it returns to the main line of tradition, and it is right and good that it should. But the Spirit is a very unsettling Person. Of the contention that every Service should include both the preaching of the Word and the Breaking of Bread, much might be said on historical grounds: but I cannot find that the Gospel requires this.

> The act of worship should be such as to bring home to us the vivid personality of Christ and give us communion with Him in the Spirit[3].

How is that to be done? It will not necessarily be done by a carefully-balanced Service, that makes explicit every article of the Christian Creed and leans heavily upon tradition. In the one moment of vision we may see the whole Christ and make the whole response.

The Rev. E. R. Micklem, in his admirable *Our Approach to God,* divides the Service into three parts, having in mind the story of the Transfiguration: 1. The Opening of the Heavens—the opening hymns, lessons, prayers and the sermon. 2. Waiting on the Mountain-top—silent prayer after the sermon, appropriating the grace there offered. 3. The Descent to the Plain—notices, offertory, intercessions. This is a fruitful thought; it gives good opportunity to lay hold of that sense of *commission* which is so often lacking from our Services. But I have doubts as to whether the congregation can give their minds to prayer for any length of time at that stage of the Service.

A Service should have one central theme: and in this connection let us remember the Christian Calendar. I have heard of Free Churches in which at Easter there was no mention of the Resurrection, and at Whitsuntide no mention of the Holy Spirit. But it is surely good for our souls to live by the calendar of the Christian year, which sets before us in turn the expectation of the Lord, His coming, His suffering, His death, resurrection, and ascension, and the outpouring of the Spirit. And its crown is Trinity Sunday—it gives us five-and-twenty Sundays to stay and worship there!

The Content of the Service

On one of the towers of Bath Abbey there is a carving of Jacob and his ladder—a symbol of the worship of the Church, God's Word coming down to us, our words going up to God. This rhythm runs all through the Service. We begin with a call to

[3] *Christian Worship, Decline and Recovery,* 8.

worship—God's word to us; we make response in prayer and hymn; and so on through the Service. B. L. Manning rubbed it in that "hymns are our liturgy, hymns are our creed[4]"; and that therefore it matters so much that we sing good and appropriate hymns: and a good hymn, he says, "combines personal experience with a presentation of historic events and doctrines, and is Scriptural". I agree, but two comments are necessary. Scriptural language is not always understood by our generation. I have heard of a rather pagan companion of one of our church members who whispered: "Tell me, what is my Ebenezer? I'd gladly raise it if I knew what it was". (He evidently thought it was some sort of bonnet.) We need to make all the use we can of good modern hymns, the thoughts and words of which are more obviously related to daily life (unfortunately there are not many of them), and also sometimes to explain the great objective Scriptural hymns and call attention to their merits. The other comment is this: of the two halves of a hymn, the tune is the greater. A bad or heavy tune can create antipathy to a good hymn; and a rousing tune can, alas, carry very poor words. Most people enjoy singing; it is a natural taste that can be stimulated in diverse ways. I have heard of a chaplain who, announcing his second hymn, said:

> You know that I can preach for ten minutes, or I can preach for half an hour. If this hymn isn't sung much better than the first, I shall preach for half an hour.

It raised the rafters! Hearty singing has no necessary relation to true worship. The function of music as a handmaid to worship is a subject that needs investigation.

Concerning the prayers: many Christians fail to weave together their Bible-reading and their prayers. Yet it is meet and right so to do. God speaks to us through the Bible; we make response in appropriate prayer. Prayer divorced from the Bible is apt to become thin and unsatisfying, going round and round in our own little circle of wants with our own very limited vocabulary. But consider only the *Psalms,* that mirror of the human soul. All we know is there, perfectly expressed; yes, and much more that we might learn, that our souls might be enlarged. Isaac Watts says[5]:

> The Spirit of God in prayer will often bless the use of His own language: and I am persuaded this is one way whereby the Spirit helps our infirmities and becomes a Spirit of supplication in us, by suggesting to us particular passages of Scripture, that are useful to furnish us both with matter and expression in prayer. It would be of excellent use to improve us in the gift of prayer, if in our daily reading the Word of God we did observe what expressions were suited to the several

[4] See especially the last paper in *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts.*

[5] *A Guide to Prayer. Works,* III. 142.

> parts of this duty—Adoration, Confession, Petition or Thanksgiving—and let them be wrought into our addresses to God that day. Nay, if we did but remember one verse every day, and fix it into our hearts by frequent meditation, and work it into our prayers morning and evening, it would in time grow up to a treasure of divine sense and language, fit to address our Maker upon all occurrences of life.

No doubt this applies more particularly to our private prayers (and what a difference it would make to our worship if all came to it prepared by such a practice of private prayer!), but it does also apply to our public prayers. Most of us have got out of the way of it, and badly done it can be dreadful: but let me quote a few words from an article by the Rev. A. G. Matthews[6]:

> We are not as our fathers; yet it may still be possible that a wise use of Scripture in the prayers of the congregation might give us something that none of our latter-day liturgical experiments have come near providing. To take one point only, and it is the crucial one. The soul of worship is the adoring recognition of the being and presence of God. It is doubtless necessary in our common devotions to remind ourselves, or to be reminded, of our troubles and insufficiencies; but the topic is a well-worn one, and in any case they are only a fractional portion of the sum-total of reality. It is God whom we are met to worship, God who is the answer to sins and sorrows, under God that we know the claim of the world's tragedy upon our intercession. There the Bible can help us. In so far as words can mediate that central Reality there are none like those of Scripture. It is not for their verbal music or their verbal grandeur that we want them, but for the quality of the faith that inspired them. The men of the Bible were strongest where we are weakest. Their apprehension of God was objective. They looked out upon Him as upon the mountains round about them. That apprehension is enshrined in their words, and through them is still communicable and creative.

Notwithstanding this, many are looking for a *Book of Worship*, convinced that congregations do not follow and participate in long extempore prayers today (if they ever did), and convinced also of the psychological value of prayers and responses in which the congregation join. The wholly satisfying book does not exist; but those who have underrated it might note the praises given to the *Book of Congregational Worship* by W. D. Maxwell[7] and Evelyn Underhill[8], and reconsider the *Ten Orders of Worship*[9] from that book for congregational use.

Augustine prayed: "O Lord, who canst teach thy faithful people without the din of words, teach us". Do we not need to

[6] *Mansfield College Magazine*, XIV. 471.
[7] *Outline of Christian Worship*, 143.
[8] *Worship*, 303.
[9] Published separately by Independent Press.

experiment more in the use of silence? At two points its value is plain: at the beginning of the service, that in quietness we may find out what is "the soul's sincere desire"; and after the sermon.

The Lord's Supper.

First, there is room for a variety of modes of observance[10]. Second, can we not break away from the idea of the "after-service"? Let the opening part of the service be a real pre-Communion Service, leading on with as little break as possible to the Lord's Supper.

Other Services of the Church.

Mr. Manning, in his article on "The Burial of the Dead", *Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1941 (a fine example of the application of principles of Evangelical worship), wrote:

> The funeral service still gives by far the most important and by far the most frequent opportunity which the Church has of making direct contact with the outsider. . . . Is it not then of more than ordinary importance to ask what use we make of these few minutes when we confront Everyman with the elemental tragedy of life and death, and can say to him the best that has been given us to know concerning God and man, concerning our life here and hereafter? . . . I stand amazed at the way in which this opportunity is often missed.

We may vary the form of Burial Service in the Book of Common Prayer, substituting other lessons and extempore prayers, adding an address and hymns, giving expression to the communion of saints and a higher note of triumph. But the three elements there given must remain: a realistic facing of the fact of death; a plain statement of the Good News of the Resurrection; and comfort in the full sense of the word.

What was here said about "the opportunity of making direct contact with those outside our borders" is true also, in measure, of marriages and baptisms. We need some form of Baptismal Service in which the parents and the Church have part, that sets forth something of the meaning of the rite: and ministers know how extraordinarily difficult it often is to make a wedding an act of worship. Perhaps the best solution is an early morning Communion Service for the bride and bridegroom and their intimate friends, and an address at the Marriage Service to the congregation in general.

Special Services.

We often find our most real moments of worship in "Special" Services: sometimes, as in the case of a celebration or a play, because it is more explicitly a corporate act crowning a piece of

[10] Note the 5 orders in the *Rodborough Bede Book.*

work together; but sometimes simply because it is "special". We all tire of the customary ritual and need variety. It has been said recently that we should differentiate more between Morning and Evening Service. How different can the Evening Service be? Discussions, dialogues, lantern slides, films, celebrations, plays—these are all good on occasions. I read that in a Chinese Christian College at the beginning of the term there is a great act of re-dedication, in which there is brought into the service a palette from the art room, a beaker from the chemical laboratory, a tool from the engineering shop, a book or notebook from the lecture room, and so on; thus relating worship to daily life. Some would make the Evening Service definitely a time for instruction. All these have their place; but the deeper need is for training in worship.

Training and Experiment.

The importance of training young people in worship is now widely recognized. It is comparatively easy to lead Juniors to worship: much more difficult with Intermediates and Seniors. (You can talk to them about worship, but that is quite another thing.) Unconventional ways are usually best. Many can testify to the help found in worship through the adoption of "Family Church" principles; particularly in the ideas of Church friends, acts of worship related to particular projects, and the celebration of the great Festivals by the whole family of the Church together.

The Rodborough Guild, which I know only from hearsay and from a study of the *Bede Book,* provides points of interest. Here is a system of progressive graduations—as Friend, Bible-reader, Worshipper, Abstainer, Remembrancer, Communicant, Helper—and also Votary vows (*e.g.,* the *Tektone:* "I promise to stand for good work, fair dealing and the Golden Rule in all the business affairs of the world"). Each graduation is marked by a short act of worship, and at each the candidate is put in mind of previous promises. Note here: (1) the use of symbolism. Adults are awkward in it, because they have got out of the way of it; but it is natural to children; (2) acts of worship related to particular life-experiences; (3) perhaps most valuable, the idea of specific vows, defined objectives, undertaken before the Lord and in the Fellowship: "I will pay my vows unto the Lord here in the presence of all His people".

There is much also that is suggestive in Leslie Davison's *The Cross in the Club*[11], an account of work with the tough lads of Bermondsey. The background is an outgoing love creating a real fellowship and a firm discipline. But here again is the use and the appeal of colour and symbolism and the vow, the imagery of chivalry, and appropriate emblems.

[11] Epworth Press.

We can learn much from such youth experiments for adults also, for in our Services are many little instructed in the Christian faith or worship. (1) We need to give much more attention to terms, vocabulary, and approach. I remember a "popular" Service at which the preacher kept on telling us that what we needed was "the circumcision of the Holy Ghost". We have to learn to be more simple and direct, to avoid, paraphrase, or explain many of the words and phrases familiar and full of meaning to ourselves. We can take little for granted; we have to arouse interest, we have to show relevance.

(2) "Worship is transcendent wonder". In our daily lives in this modern world we don't use enough the sense of wonder. Yet it is there in most men and women; the newspapers know how to appeal to it. There is no real living worship without wonder: where there is wonder there is always the germ of worship. Worship is wonder and love; a living church will be full of the germs of wonder and love.

(3) We need more faithfully and more vividly to preach Jesus —even to the extent of setting aside our own fondness for St. Paul, to preach the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. Recent *N.T.* criticism, in any case, has shown how far the whole Gospel is implicit in every story and saying. But Jesus in his relations with men came and comes before all doctrines about Him.

(4) The Bishop of Southwell has declared that it takes a Christian to say "Nothing that is human is alien to me". Is there apparent in our worship a lively, loving interest in all the wonder of the world, in all that men are doing, and all that God is doing in the world today, a very evident belief in the Creator Spirit and the Incarnate Son of Man?

I close as I began; there is no short cut to the revival of worship today, but there are many calls to endeavour and experiment. And at the heart of the matter is our need to be delivered from our individualism. As Dr. Temple has written:

> We must cease to think and feel either in the vertical dimension wherein we are related to God, or in the horizontal dimension wherein we are related to our neighbours, and substitute the triangular relationship God-self-neighbour, neighbour-God-self.

So the fullness of Christian worship is the worship of a Christian community, sharing in life, work, and God.

A VIEW FROM THE PEW.

BEING THE SOLILOQUY OF A LAYMAN WHEN HE SHOULD HAVE BEEN LISTENING TO THE SERMON.

By Arnold Nichols.

The church I am sitting in is a Congregational church; it is very sparsely attended, and the reason is, of course, the apathy of the people outside. This state of affairs has almost outworn its welcome as a useful subject of inquiry; we have become resigned to it; there will be a revival in God's good time, and for the present we must be patient and keep the problem on one side like a funded debt.

We are almost too familiar with the hardy annuals of our Church Councils: How can we reach the outsider? How can we make our services more attractive? How can we capture the young people? If resolutions could fill pews we should long ago have dusted the seats in our gallery. If committees and subcommittees could stir up latent energies we should by now be seeking specifications for a larger building; but the apathy outside remains, and the problem is still present with us who are within.

I remember an isolated occasion when our church was filled to capacity. Some leader in public affairs visited the town and spoke from our pulpit. How strange it was to see row upon row of people where we had become so accustomed to gaps and spaces! And was it not a trifle upsetting to pick out the familiar figures of "our own people" dotted about in unsuitable pews, looking most uncomfortable without the usual room to spread? It was frightening, too, to see the tense looks on the faces of the sidesmen as they hurried about controlling that vast multitude. The whole affair was most exciting, and we wonder the church did not collapse when they all rose to sing the hymn. We remember, too, the impression left by that event, and how we simply refused to believe it when we were told that the congregation consisted of but five hundred souls.

But that day passed, and I have an idea that, were the truth known, some feeling of relief accompanied a reversion to the more appropriate tranquillity of our normal life. Is it not a good thing that our church does not have to bear such a strain every week? After all, that was not really a congregation, it was an audience.

There is always plenty of room thus to soliloquize in my pew, and I begin by questioning whether we are capable of meeting the demands which the answer to our own prayers would make upon us. It is still easier to send the multitude away than it is to give them to eat.

The cathedral verger gathers his party of sightseers round him and proudly waves his hand towards the great stained-glass window as the light of the sun carries its colours through the pillared nave. "There", he cries, "when the sun gets round to that window you see the real glory of this church. I wish I could show that to every person in this city". But the man in the street, as he passes the cathedral, sees no such attraction. To him that window is but a drab, colourless framework—for he views it from the wrong side. So we may proclaim to the passing population that a clearer view of the glory of God and a finer conception of the beauty of holiness can be cultivated from inside, yet we have not solved the verger's problem.

What then is indicated? In the first place, I would make the assertion that a movement has no justification for the expansion of its influence if it has departed from the central function of its foundation. In resisting the Act of Uniformity the Nonconformist churches broke away with much force and started the pendulum process of another "movement". The reaction against the dictatorship of the priesthood produced the authority of the "freed" individual. It would seem that the seat of our trouble may be found in the neighbourhood of this reaction.

The history of all progressive movements has shown that they have only developed as living forces when they have been controlled and guided by the wind of the Spirit, which first set them in motion. My church secured her freedom, but does not ensue it; and so it is losing it. Though it broke away from the bondage of uniformity it has almost become the prisoner of its own conventions. It has allowed itself to be crabbed by its traditions. It has embalmed the bones of its forefathers with a devotion that has nevertheless obscured its unfettered vision of the Kingdom of the Living.

Thus the man in the pew soliloquizes, and he may of course be charged with the fault he is decrying, for he is one of the church members. But his view from the pew is still that of a progressive Church, ordained by God, founded by Christ, needing only to be rescued from itself and put again on the high road of progress. That is why he is not outside.

My church is not yet dead, neither is it altogether devoid of a wholesome anxiety (we hold meetings and look into the future and the minister loves to hear the people express themselves), but it is bound by thongs which have become part of its uniform. It sings about marching as to war, but its fetters will only allow it to mark time; most Free Church meetings demonstrate this simple fact. Periods of dissatisfaction occur at intervals and the Church cries out for "revival", but I am not sure whether all those who join in the cry know what it is that has to be revived. Moreover, they

take it for granted that the institution would be able, at any moment, to bear the strain of such an upheaval.

You cannot put new wine into old wineskins, and there is no more pathetic sight than an attempt to produce a "revival" on the lines of nineteenth century mass evangelism. Even Torrey and Alexander in the Albert Hall forty years ago were almost too late. Such efforts to awaken life in the dying embers of the Victorian Church must take their place on the wall with the hand-bellows of a bygone mentality. Large halls have been used many times since in attempts to manufacture conversions of Pentecostal proportions, but modern experience has shown that the value of stirred emotion has been discredited in the realm of pure religion: the appeal of the emotional seems to be as dead as the "Glory Song". Christ Himself did not arouse emotions; neither, I would add, did He attempt to retain institutions because they were adorned with ecclesiastical trappings; to Him forms of worship were not sacrosanct. We have been shown many times that God has no response to the "revival" prayer, and until we turn our attention to the meaning of this He will still leave us behind to play at chapels in the nursery.

The churches have marked time long enough, and before they can claim to be heard by the multitude outside they must be able to overtake them, bearing the Evangel with unrestricted movement. The man in the pew brings in from the world a vivid experience of the pace of life. He sees the Church far behind the column, calling out to the modern world to turn round and take notice of her; and marching civilization cries out for a new moving fellowship of God's people, an institution that can keep abreast of the marchers. Nothing short of drastic upheaval will urge the Church of Christ forward in the modern world. Revolution is not a pleasant word; it frightens the timid; it shocks the constitutional (it would not be allowed on the minutes in our vestry), but there is no other word for this occasion. We like remedies and we like revivals, but we fear disruption.

Our bombed churches are the hope of the denomination. They, at least, face the new world with a clean page—an unrestricted field of action. Those of us who are over fifty should hesitate before we throw in our lot with the business of reconstruction, lest we hamper their newly won freedom: "Prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (*Mal.* 3^{10}). How terrifying! We are thankful that such texts are not accepted at their literal value in these enlightened days. So far as blessings from heaven are concerned, we pray for them, but not in torrents like this. The Holy Spirit has such an unfortunate way of breaking the nets when He gets to business. We do not

mind improvements or embellishments, but we dare not "prove God herewith".

In the second place, I feel the urgent necessity for a new kind of personal fellowship. The whole force must be re-equipped. Here is something more than an improvement; it does not begin on the surface and is much deeper than the social life of the Church as we know it today. It is something drastic, revolutionary. It begins in the people. Christian unity is not the least important deficiency in the Church today.

There was much consternation in the Deacons' Meeting of a country church one day when a young man, recently elected to that body, moved "that this diaconate should forthwith be made into a fellowship". A moment of awkward silence followed before normal business was resumed. "Are we not all friends?" asked the minister. Of course they were. Such a young recruit could not be expected to accommodate his fresh and buoyant religious life all at once to the conditions he found, but the simplicity of his candour provides the keynote to the situation. This young man had come into a church, not a rotary club, and his Testament was in his pocket. He had accepted the challenge of the new commandment without question; he had overlooked those barriers of human superstition and incredulity which Paul met in the Jews and the Greeks (*1 Cor.* 1^{23}). The fact was that our young friend had been possessed of the devil and his soul had cried out for deliverance. So he joined the community of God's people in the hope of finding an ally among those men who, he was sure, would be able to help. He took a fancy to the sidesman who had collected his shilling on the previous Sunday, and asked if he could speak with him. "Certainly", replied the sidesman. And so the young fellow opened out in a way he would not have thought of doing to his own father. The sidesman was taken aback; he could not return this sort of confidence, but he would arrange an interview with the minister: this matter called for more professional handling. When the minister heard the story he challenged his sidesman: "Why did you not deal with this yourself?" The reply was halting and evasive. "Come now, surely you are a fellow man?" Still the sidesman hedged. "I see", replied the minister, "then go back to that young man and make your confession to him, and you will both regain your confidence; then come to me both together and we will pray". And so the young man's astonishment was soon changed to brotherly love, and now they are both "Free Churchmen".

I like thus to bring the case of this young deacon forward before he settles down in the church. If religious fellowship disappears from the home or the Wednesday meeting-room it will not reappear in the church; yet, without such a fellowship of personal communion between men and men in the congregation it is useless to

cry out for that sign from heaven we call "revival". We may dress the Table with a clean white cloth once a month, but the efficacy of the Ordinance depends on the quality of our communion one with another during the past thirty days. Public worship is but corporate expression; fellowship is spiritual intimacy. An audience is but a collection of individuals; a congregation is a united family.

Perhaps it is too much to imagine a body of people in this century having all things in common on apocalyptic lines. This can only be achieved when the people's faith is set on a single divine event towards which all their thought, enterprise and economy are directed. But there is still another unity of spiritual purpose which does not insist on communal segregation of this kind, and it seems to me that "revival" will only follow a quickening of this kind of spiritual activity. As I sit soliloquizing in my pew, can I blame that man over there, who in a few minutes will sing tenor, because he does not know me who sings bass? According to the number on the hymn board we shall soon be contributing to the harmony of

Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love,

and I don't know him from Adam.

The reason our church is half empty is not only the apathy of the people outside, and I feel much hesitancy in raising my voice when I am not in fellowship with the man who sings tenor. The hostess at a large party will pin numbers on the backs of her guests, and in half an hour the company is transformed into a social entity. Do I not bear His mark? How many deacons could speak with perfect frankness about their spiritual life to their fellow church members? How many ministers know their deacons after this manner? Yet, so long as our churches exist merely as communities for corporate worship so long will they be prisoners caged in their own individualism; they will not be free, and the Church Militant will remain the Church Stagnant.

One of Einstein's theories is that a single electron, isolated in space, is "uneventful". That is to say, there is no "event" in the evolution of the universe unless two or more forces come into contact. Why this is so is beyond us to explain. We only know it as another of those facts of science which helps us to bridge the great chasm which for ages has separated the findings of reason from the visions of faith.

Many churches may be capable of existing as they are for a long time; in fact, like old abbeys and manor houses, they may retain a modicum of respect, but they do not live on this. Fellowship—not just friendship—is the life-blood of the institution as Christ founded it, yet the blending of spiritual experience is not the strongest feature of our Free Church life.

"No man liveth unto himself" may be quoted and accepted as a mere statement of scientific fact, which it is, but such a scientific fact cannot carry men onwards in the world without end without activity of the Spirit. Even as no force, however minute, can exist, as a force, in isolation, no personality can have a place in the spiritual realm as a separate individual. The old Salvationist was surely expressing a great truth when he said, "My brothers, remember nobody has ever gone to Heaven alone".

Sitting over there, near the man who sings tenor, is a young woman, nondescript in appearance, with a somewhat hard, over-aged face. Why does she stare for a time and then jerk her head suddenly, as though she were cutting across a train of thought? I am sure there is a story behind that escaping movement; perhaps the minister knows something about it, though I have not come across anyone in the church who has more than a social relationship with her. I wonder why she is a Congregationalist? Perhaps she has always sat there—at first with her parents, dead long since, and a family of brothers and sisters, now distributed over the world, and her roots have become embedded in the "place" of that association.

> Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst.

Such a contact of human personalities means the simple sharing of spiritual experiences. Here is Einstein's miracle; the collision of forces which alone can cause life to become "eventful". Gathering together is not just sitting together. I wonder if *this* is why the churches are half empty?

Let us further consider the effect of this new freedom on our church life. I enjoy a good sermon on Sunday, and I have been brought up to accept the pulpit as the centre of Congregationalism; but the coming revival will not by-pass the pulpit. The fusion of spiritual forces in the Church would revolutionize its function, and I can see a new kind of message emerging from the process. For instance, I can see sermons being delivered, on occasion, by more than one person, people who have, through a spiritual fusion, themselves become ministers; spiritual allies who have been converted by the miracle of contact and become as little children in their religious life, with that open-hearted candour which, alas, so many of us have outgrown. A band of such forces, whose co-ordination has created a living message, would deliver that message as a unity to the Church; that is, either by a series of personal contributions or witness to the Grace of God forming the sermon, or, where this may be impracticable, by the gathering of these contributions by the minister to form the burden of his own message. Thus, instead of preparing a weekly sermon, the minister would prepare his people and co-ordinate the materials of worship.

Instead of mounting the pulpit steps alone he would feel he was joining a new fellowship of ministers and sharing with them the joys of corporate worship. After all, are we not entering a new world?

I do not attack the preaching of the Gospel, nor the function of the pulpit, as a means to an end, but I do attack the outworn institution of armchair discourses as a *sine qua non* of corporate worship, and I do resent the degrading of the means of grace to the level of a training-ground for pulpit giants. (Our leading 'Temples of Nonconformity' whose congregations are drawn from greater distances do not come within the scope of this inquiry.) We used to "go to hear Parker", and ever since those days we have boasted to our friends that we "heard Parker". Oh yes, among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than Parker. But in the Church today those that are caught up by the Spirit and raised by a contact with kindred forces into eventful activity outshine the greatness of the prophets.

No one can foresee the course of a revolution, as he cannot predict the effect of a civil war. There is no telling where such an upheaval of human forces will lead. When the Spirit of God charges a single human nature it becomes alive, and the only thing required to create an "event" is contact. This is revival, and if it did attack our churches there would be such upheavals that the time-honoured characteristics of pew and pulpit alike would suffer great dislocation. We pray for revival. If it came, would the minister in the pulpit like it?

Church visitation is not a new practice, but it takes on a new character when the possession of this activity illuminates those who are the visitors. A man will offer you a seat in his car and drive you to the door of your church without responding to the invitation to enter. He considers he has fulfilled his duty as a neighbour when you have alighted. It has been his pleasure to do you a service, but as far as the church is concerned he is an "outsider", and the place for an outsider is—outside. To have joined you in worship would have presented to him no scope for further personal service, and by inviting him to enter you assume the existence of a fellowship which first needs to be cultivated.

Though an invitation to go to church may thus meet with a disappointing response from the apathetic neighbour, a request to him for helpful advice on a problem of living would probably raise his neighbourliness to a level of fellowship. It resolves itself into the question of the law of "eventful contact", such contact being created only when the personalities which constitute these forces recognize in each other a common ground of need.

So I have learned from my soliloquy this disquieting fact; upon the man in the pew, as well as the pulpit, depends the salvation of

the Church. Revival, from the viewpoint of the pulpit, might be expected to show itself in larger and livelier congregations, before which the prestige and awe of that pillar of Congregationalism would visibly grow, for is not the preaching of the Gospel the central artery of Congregationalism? To tamper with this pulpit is, I know, a presumption which would cause the boldest reformer to hesitate; but a revolutionary has long sight, he sees a goal far beyond the city in which he dwells, and if a steeple in the foreground obstruct his vision he removes it.

The cry for the revival of fellowship will produce a new pulpit —a pulpit shorn of that peculiar authority with which tradition has clothed it. It must become again the servant of the minister instead of the academic chair of the preacher. There are some old chapels which still have their heating stoves standing in the middle of the aisle, with their primitive looking flue-pipes reaching to the roof. Today the minister's wife still has to make her furniture and homely tastes suit the manse allotted to her, and her good husband must provide his pulpit with two half-hourly sermons on the Gospel According To The Senior Deacon, and having satisfied these conditions they can begin their Free Church life.

If all our diaconates became fellowships and all our committees met in the family spirit, the Church would be inspired with such a hurricane of power that all our permanent fixtures, all our traditional institutions, would be dislodged from their authority, and the fear of something new, something original, would be overcome by the confidence of fellowship. In the Free Church today no form, ceremony, instrument, nor any other structure should be accepted as established; let our fathers turn in their graves if that is the price. There is no longer room for a cargo of antiques, however time-honoured, however beautiful, unless such symbols are created by the necessity of current human expression, but when that necessity is outworn the symbols should go lest they again become rusted into the fetters of superstition.

And so we clear for action, and we can raise our eyes without fear to the windows of heaven and receive without obstruction the glorious colours of His light.

A CHALLENGE TO MY CHRISTIANITY.

By Alec R. Ellis.

I have just been irritated to the point of thought. I have been forced to acknowledge that Christianity, as practised by me, is the easy way out. I do not derive any great consolation from suspecting that I belong to a goodly fellowship, but I do feel impelled to pass on some of the arguments of my assailant who has the right of criticism by virtue of his own practices.

What does Christianity mean to me, not in theory, but in practice? Well, I go to church, though not as regularly as my fellow worshippers think befitting a member of a church council. In my own home I try to be sweetly reasonable in all things and to do my share of the chores. In my business dealings I am honest and I try to be fair. If I give my word I stand by it and I would not take an unfair advantage of the necessity of any man. I could think of quite a lot of other extenuating circumstances, but as these would involve delving into and publicizing what my friends have been pleased to refer to as my good points, I have decided not to do it. Suppose we say that I am an average person, not particularly good and not bad enough to have attracted the attention of police or press, and let us leave it at that.

Well, it immediately becomes obvious that while I have accepted the Christian ideal as the thing at which to aim; while I acknowledge it to be the finest, the holiest, and most inspiring thing in the whole human story; and while I have given it my loyalty and devotion, I haven't exactly put myself out to practise it.

I like going to church, but I wonder whether there is in these days any particular virtue in so doing, apart from the spiritual uplift which I go to gain, and in the support my presence gives to a good cause. Just over three hundred years ago it was an offence punishable by death to practise the faith professed by the worshippers at a certain chapel in Liverpool. Services were held behind locked doors in candlelight, and when the sound of marching feet was heard outside the candle was put out and the service was suspended, the congregation remaining in silent darkness until the sound of marching feet had died away. That chapel was always crowded; today, in the same little building, to which the worshippers are summoned by the tolling of the cracked bell presented to the congregation by Oliver Cromwell, there are empty seats. The moral obviously is that what costs nothing is not valued. If I had to fight for the right to attend a place of worship of my own choosing, if I knew that I ran the risk of death every

time I went to church, I could, at any rate, claim virtue in holding fast to my beliefs and practising them under such conditions.

But I can take no such stand, and so one of my principal claims to being a Christian is rendered, well, at least dubious.

While it is the usual thing in a Christian country for the vast majority of its inhabitants to describe themselves as Christians—although over 50 per cent of them never set foot inside a church as worshippers at one of the regular services—it must surely be conceded that the way in which the non-churchgoer lives his life is, on an average, just as satisfactory from the Christian social standpoint as that of the churchgoer. How far this may be attributed to the nationally profound effect of the presence of the Christian religion in our midst is another matter.

What my critic has against me is that I profess Christianity but have very little real intention of practising it. Judged by his standards, I am afraid that there is a lot in what he says. I have not sold all I possess and given to the poor; I have given of my surplus and not of my necessity. I have disobeyed the commandment to swear not at all, and when I have been smitten on one cheek I have not always offered up the other. As for loving my enemies, well, having seen a bit of Nazi work at first hand I have been filled with merely a savage desire to kill the perpetrators.

I cannot claim to have taken no thought for my life, what I shall eat or what I shall drink or what I shall put on. Neither can I claim not to have stood in judgment of others.

And this is not the whole tale of my shortcomings, but it is probably sufficient to be going on with.

In the face of this dissection of my practices I was stung to retort:

"Well, can you tell me of anyone who does follow literally the precepts of Christ?"

"I can do better", he said, "I can show you some who are trying to do so".

I was familiar with the experiences of the Fleet Street journalist, recounted in *God in the Slums* and *God in the Shadows*. The work of the Salvation Army has always come very near my idea of what Christ would praise if He came again. I couldn't start a meeting in the street as they do. It only embarrasses me to make a public display of my religion. But I admire their courage none the less, and could and have joined with them in what I call their "real" work.

But it was not to the Salvation Army that he took me. We went first of all to a railway station, where we met an old chap who had gone into the highways and byways to look for people who needed his help. He and his wife had decided that for their

war service they would throw open their home to those in need of a quiet week-end, or of shelter (there are many tragedies in war-time that can be helped by the provision of rest and shelter at the right time, and a railway station is quite a good place at which to find them).

While we were with him he spotted an A.T.S. girl in distress. She was stranded, having had her handbag containing her money and railway pass stolen. Discovering her loss, she had left the train, and was a stranger in a strange city. The policeman to whom she told the sad tale knew the old chap and beckoned him over: "Here's something right up your street". He took the girl home, where his wife looked after her and set her on her way on the morrow with a bright face and money in her pocket. Real Good Samaritan stuff, that!

My critic nudged me. "If there were a few more people putting themselves out to do what that old man is doing it would make a difference to many of our wartime problems of soldiers and girls, wouldn't it?" I conceded that it would.

The steps of a great cathedral were our next port of call. I had frequently commented to myself in passing that it was an affront to God that the steps of this cathedral should be swarming with unwashed children, chalking all over the stonework, showering stones at each other and at the building, teeming hordes of uncared-for humanity from the slums in the middle of which this cathedral was being built. But I had done nothing about it.

A lady, on her way home from work one day, had seen an even worse demonstration of disorderliness when a milk bottle had been smashed against the beautiful carved doors of the cathedral. Instead of remarking that something ought to be done about it, she did the something. She gathered the children together in the porch and told them a story. They begged her to come again, and she did, and has been many times.

To see this gang of children, from three years old to sixteen and even seventeen, gather around this woman whom they had accepted as their teacher, and to listen to her words, was to make one realize that the words, "Suffer the little children to come unto me", had a vital meaning for someone still.

"Think what could be done if there were more people like her", whispered my critic with emphasis. We called on a woman who had looked after a sick neighbour for several months. The old lady had become bedridden and her son was away with the army in the Middle East. Under such circumstances the authorities would normally arrange for such a person to be removed to an institution, but the woman we visited was doing what she did out of sympathy. "It would be a pity if public charity ever came to take the place of private charity, wouldn't it?" hinted my mentor.

We went to a lot of other places and saw all kinds of people doing for other people all kinds of things which they had no need to do. It seemed as though every human problem had someone who was working to solve it. "But think what a marvellous place the world would be if everybody made a point of finding time to fit in something extra on the lines that these people are doing", urged the voice at my elbow.

"How would you start?" I asked.

"Well, it all depends where your special interests lie. If you have no special line beyond a desire to do something you might do very much worse than take up your stand in a railway station and keep your eyes open".

So that is what I did, and discovered all by myself that in the Father's house there are indeed many mansions.

THE CATECHISM WAY OF LIFE.

By the Rev. J. D. Copp, B.A., Samoa.

One of my college friends used to carry with him a little black notebook in which was written a careful if incomplete list of the problems which have challenged the minds of every generation. These, Beauty, Evil, God, Man, Pain, and the like, were arranged alphabetically, and on opposite pages, for quick reference, were his own conclusions. We had just been introduced to philosophy, and I remember envying for a time his enjoyment of comparative omniscience. Of course, we soon found that the deep questions of life cannot be answered in that pat fashion, and in the score of years since have had many a laugh at this brave adolescent attempt. But not at the listing, and certainly not at the framing of opinions —these are as necessary for the evolution of consciousness as is drink for thirst—but rather at the putting of a period, a full stop, where there should have been, at the very most, a semicolon.

And it was absurd, was it not, to think of capturing a God, rumoured to be infinite, in a net of words? To expect final pronouncements, at that or at any age, about the mysteries of the human heart? To place the sky, with its grandeur and aloofness, and the humble earth, with all that it sustains and at last receives, in a fixed and eternal hierarchy of values? In short, to attempt *a Catechism Way of Life?*

And yet I wonder how many of us are ever delivered from doing just that? We may not carry and reverence a little black notebook, but put us in a corner, set us to attack a problem or to defend a position, and see what weapons we produce. The demand is for a living concept, one that is alert and fully informed—say, the meaning of Freedom, or of Love today—and what is our response? Frequently, so frequently a truncated and embalmed thing; a thing produced in a dead and deadly penny-in-the-slot fashion. And in this age of uniforms (uniform . . . uniformity) when, to such an admitted extent, propaganda has been substituted for education, and technical knowledge made to pass for wisdom, we are particularly glib. It shows in the speeches we make and listen to, in the articles and books we produce and read, and perhaps most of all in the way in which we assume and presume the life and thought of others and cry havoc when the forthcoming answer is not in the Catechism of the day.

Now a Catechism may have its uses. In religion, for example, where there is immaturity, it may be preferred to zeroness. But where we have reasonable expectation of adulthood, to be content with a gramophone reply is to show sterility, invite chaos, and

encourage death. When one may walk in a rich and growing garden, an indoor, book description of a flower can never be enough. In the more secure periods of history the urge to "go out into the garden" was always pressing, but now, in this hour, it has become a sharp command, a command we shall disobey at our children's peril.

If a weather bureau were to set up, take its readings for a day, close down with the night, and expect its figures to be valid for every month and every year that followed, we should name it stupid. And as planes and ships, using this information, crashed and foundered, we should find it not only stupid but culpable. In the darkness that is over all the earth there is pragmatic proof that something of this stupid and culpable weather-bureau error has been made. In high places, both secular and religious, there has been belief in frozen truth; in definitions and destinies that must be. But the oxygen of yesterday can never fill the lungs of today. The Catechism Way, the intoning of canonized phrases, can never send us, free and creative, into the future.

What then must we do? First, see the wide presence of the Catechism Way of Life and name it what it is, our enemy. And second? Shall we go on then to produce a new set of beliefs, beliefs that are careful enough to take account of both the values from the past and the end-findings from every field of present knowledge? As a mental exercise, a preliminary, this may be a necessary discipline, but to expect from it a final solution is to repeat the method-error we are here condemning; it is to invoke Beelzebub to do that which Beelzebub can never do. No, our hope can never lie in a smoothed and modern creed, but rather in the adoption of experimental attitudes. Attitudes that are experimental because there must be a daily testing by results. And if the results be other than we seek, we must put aside the attitude that has given them, and adopt a new one.

But, it may be said, testing implies a standard, a measuring-rod! Yes, but we must never be tempted or tricked by logic into stating an ultimate. We must be satisfied, for this testing, with an edgeless generality. It is sufficient to say, "We seek fullness of life, wellbeing, for ourselves and for all. Those attitudes which bring this fullness we shall keep. Those which do not, no matter what the authority behind them, we shall reject".

This eschewing of rules, of fixed principles, of "eternal verities" is dangerous, yes, but only as realistic living is dangerous. The road we are called to travel is a cliff one. On the one side there is always the precipice. We can, if we choose, pitch our tent, set up a railing, and live a kind of life. But—and it seems so obvious that we wonder how it can be missed—to do this, to play safe, is never to travel.

One objection: we are not responsible for our attitudes. There is truth in this. The structure and function of the body is ever there as a determining factor. The environment, especially in the first half-dozen years of our lives, has cast us in a mould. But there is still a sufficient indeterminateness about our attitudes to allow for this experiment. And, unless we be psychotically bound, even the given can be re-shaped.

To sum up then: we are all inclined, and even encouraged to a Catechism Way of Life. But the evolution of consciousness, and perhaps our very existence, demand that we free ourselves from such a limiting, static habit of mind. One method of achieving this is to leave the protecting shadow of a fixed belief, and to advance as an omnipresent and experimental attitude may guide. To use ourselves as laboratories and an attitude chosen by our best imagination as our hypothesis, and so to come, eventually, to a way of life that will mean, in our time and for all people, fullness and wellbeing. To judge, not by assumption or by dogma, but by experienced results, and to escape forever that atrophying and discouraging Catechism approach to the world-stuff from which it is our good pleasure and our need to build a Kingdom.

THE WORLD CRISIS—THE CHURCH'S NEED TO MEET IT.

By the Rev. Ernest Woolhouse.

Prof. S. Radhakrishnan, a few years ago, asked himself why the Free Churches so frequently reported a decrease in numbers. At first he thought it must be looked for in their form of worship, but later he found the same numerical tendency in the Church of England, then in the Roman Church. As he continued his investigations he discovered this decline, speaking generally, throughout Christendom, and also amongst the Eastern religions. Thus there seemed a general decline in religion throughout the world. Now because we can never win an integrated life, as individuals, or nations, or as a world unity, without religion, such a state of things would seem sad and serious indeed. But Prof. Radhakrishnan came to the conclusion that this decline was a phase towards a new synthesis in religion. Such synthesis would be manifest in a revival of mysticism. In *Eastern Religions and Western Thought* he says, "The present indifference to religion is a sign more of deepening spirituality than of growing secularism". In some ways this may well be true. I met a young business man the other day who flatly refused to join the Christian Church because at the present he could not consistently attempt to obey the teaching of Jesus. Another I met just before the war who refused to attend public worship because the Churches were not delivering the goods. "What is the use of scientific progress if it is not controlled for high ends?" he asked. "You mean", I said, "that if you could lunch in New York, tea in Lisbon, and dine in London on the same day, these scientific achievements would get us nowhere unless by deep meditation we were being taught how to direct and spiritually control these activities". The attitude of these two types was wrong, of course, but it may reveal a quickened sense of moral values. The ebb of the sap prepares for the flow; the autumn for the spring; the buds are formed in the dark days and are awakened in the light ones; autumn and winter are essential to spring and summer, and it is one organic process throughout.

Many think there are signs of a new interest in religion in this country. Dr. C. E. M. Joad is reported to have said that

> men had brought the mentality of schoolboys to the great boon science had given the present generation. If a superman had made the aeroplane the ape had got hold of the spirit.

There had been a great increase of power but no commensurate development of the spirit:

> Spiritual life has remained stationary, starved, and stunted. Some revival was now taking place and on the accumulated religious sense of the future, civilization depended.

For the past 50 years nations have been warned of this and have let it pass by unheeded. When the late Bishop of Ripon called for a truce for ten years in scientific investigation he was really pointing out that we lacked spiritual vision to direct scientific discoveries. We needed soul culture—and this should be as scientific as growing seeds—to take charge of material riches. This soul culture is nothing less than to make the interior journey known historically as "The Mystic Way". Independent of race, age, clime, all classic types of mystical experience disclose an astonishing agreement. In the mystics there is remarkable unity of spirit. The mystics "have always stood for the fellowship of humanity". But let us be clear as to what we mean by the word. As Prof. Allinson Peers says—"Of late the word mystic has got into bad company". We are not thinking of a so-called mysticism which is only for a few, and belongs to a particular temperament. One day as we discussed mystical theology the late Father Bernard Walke of St. Hilary said he did not think anyone could know what the mystical experience was unless he was *au fait* with the spirit of Poulain's *The Graces of Interior Prayer*. Poulain divides mental prayer into ordinary and extraordinary prayer. The former in its various degrees he likens to an engine-driver who starts and stops the engine by turning a lever. The mighty power liberated is not in the doing of the man, but in the steam. So in ordinary prayer divine grace is always at our disposal. He goes on to say that it is like a bird flying in the atmosphere. The bird can soar, but it cannot fly to the stars. Its wings would be of no use for such an attempt. The bird would have to be still whilst it was carried thereon as in the hollow of God's hand. The latter is like mystical or extraordinary prayer. Poulain further remarks of these latter states that by our own industry "we are powerless to produce these even in a low degree, even momentarily". But I am using the word "mystical" to denote anyone who is being true to his heart's desire and by the grace of God so seeking to die to self and live to Christ that he is pressing on towards the achievement of the Pauline description, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me". I am thinking of the mystic as one who has fallen in love with Christ. St. John of the Cross defines mystical theology as "The science of love". The mystical state in mental prayer, in our usage of the term, can be achieved by all who will pay the price, for we all have the divine seed within us. It is the one who cultivates with strenuous but joyous dis-

cipline the outstretch of his nature in a Christ-ward direction. Dr. Rufus Jones says of the mystic:

> By purity of mind, obedience to the Heavenly Vision, he slowly accumulates a body of inner wisdom, a clear sense of spiritual direction, an unfailing conviction of fellowship with a Great Companion.

And this experience is for "whosoever will".

In an article on "The Soul of Nonconformity" in *The Month* (September-October, 1943), Dr. W. E. Orchard finds the core of the Free Church witness in the Evangelical Experience and the Evangelical Appeal. He remains convinced that

> if he understands it at all the evangelical experience is a veritable effect of the direct action of the Spirit of Christ upon the soul. . . . It is a direct and saving contact between the soul and Christ. . . . This evangelical experience in the writer's interpretation is an isolated but critical point of the Gospel of Christ, a kind of telescoped mystical experience.

Here, he thinks, "is a uniting cross-distinction of all denominations". In this experience is something

> which could be claimed as common both to the heart of Catholicism and to the soul of Nonconformity; and it is submitted that there is ground here for mutual understanding and individual fellowship with the possibility that one day, however still far off, there may be common ground for still further approach.

Then in his forthright, courageous, and beautiful way, he appeals to Catholics to recognize this evangelical experience, reminding them that to deny it as a thing impossible

> would indict a good deal of Catholic mystical doctrine as well as the purpose of Catholic practice, namely, the making of spiritual communion.

He then appeals to the Free Churches to recognize that

> Catholic Theology specially defends what is so precious to them, that Catholic devotion creates and fosters that very experience and that the Catholic Church is therefore the place where the soul of Nonconformity will alone be finally satisfied and preserved.

Without entering into discussion on the last quotation I should like to be allowed to state that (1) for over forty years I have had a deep and uninterrupted sense of organic spiritual unity with all who love the Lord; (2) at least in another sense than Dr. Orchard states, although in theory it may not be so, in practice it frequently happens that the commencement of the evangelical experience is in danger of being isolated in individuals in that we do not follow on to know the Lord. I want to be allowed to plead for the cultivation

of the spiritual life as being vitally necessary if we are to know the answer to our own unrest and the world's appalling need; that the fundamental steps of the "Mystic Way" are for every man to take and are a logical and natural continuation of the mental unfolding of children as represented by grading in education. And this culture is supremely work that should be done in the Free Churches, for however important we recognize them to be, we do not stress the creeds but the life of the Spirit.

From the moment a child's undifferentiated consciousness is transcended he becomes ego-centric, with the chief ingredient of his consciousness as being "separated from". This emphasis in changing degrees is manifest up to adolescence. Of course, a child has spiritual experiences before adolescence, but always the ego with its emphasis on "separate from" has its important part to play in the mental unfolding of a child to adolescence, when there comes to him a unique spiritual awakening. Now the "separate from" emphasis in consciousness should go; the ego-centre should be transcended. A child should die to his ego-centric experience. It has been a good friend, but now—if active—it becomes the worst enemy. A youth desires to be "carried out of himself". He insists on another centre. And it is at this stage that so often we fail. The bridge has not been well-built; the transition so often is not effectively made. We do not pass from—as the chiefest ingredient of our consciousness—"separate from" to "united to". We fail to make love the centre of our lives. We do not love God with all our heart and our neighbour as ourselves. The chief object of education from infancy to adolescence by atmosphere and teaching should be to prepare a child for this awakening and to help him effectively to bridge this gulf from the ego-self to the Christ-centre. The root cause of most of our problems lies in the fact that the majority of persons try all sorts of roads which are only blind alleys, all sorts of thrills which leave them exhausted, all sorts of food which fail to nourish. There is only one way—Christ. "I am the way": only one food—"I am the bread of life". And numbers who accept Christ as their centre at adolescence begin this new stage accepting Christ and hugging to self. They still cling to the ego-centre. It is Christ and mammon. And we know the ego as an old friend; he fights hard for his life, and we have fear of the unknown. But we learn to see that the ego must die, and be carried up into the next stage, only that which has survival value. The first step of the "Mystic Way" is spiritual "Awakening". But the second is "Purgation". And this second only means that when we surrendered to Christ it might have been whole-hearted emotionally, but the will and the mind may not have been brought into the Kingdom. Purgation historically is the retracing of our steps so that body, mind, soul, feeling, thought, will,

are utterly dedicated to Jesus Christ. We become as little children in the motive of our transparent surrender to Jesus Christ.

> Where is the blessedness I knew
> When first I saw the Lord?

Where we left it. When we re-start there comes as the third stage —"Illumination". And this roughly means that we come to see "all things in God and God in all things". "The Dark Night of the Soul" means that we come to a moment when we have to let go our props, our thrills, our emotional joys, and with no support at all except our almost blind faith in Christ we press on. We cry "Though He slay me yet will I trust in Him". We lose all except Christ, and find whereas previously we were possessed by persons and things, now we are possessed of nothing, but in Christ possess all things. Then we grow toward union with God in Christ Jesus. In some—perhaps dim—way we are moving toward the Pauline experience "For to me to live is Christ". "It doth not yet appear what we shall be". There are grades of union with Christ, but some experience of union with Him is open to "whosoever will". A method should be evolved to help us toward this goal. It is beyond the scope of this article to deal with this, but it is first utter surrender to Jesus Christ—"None of self and all of Thee", and then a method to assist us by the grace of Christ to "grow in grace".

As we become rooted in Christ our vision is clarified. We move more and more toward the integration of our personality—holiness—in Christ and see the solution of our personal problems as we meet them, even unto the communion of saints. We come to see that we shall never be able to face up to the challenge of the reunion of the Churches without this growing vision of personal holiness. And we shall find that this experience of growing towards individual wholeness leads us to the experiential knowledge of that freedom which makes us free indeed. We shall discover ourselves cleaving to the experience we have of Christ which is "a uniting cross-distinction of all denominations". We shall know something in our hearts of the Pentecostal fellowship. And we shall be enabled to accept the challenge of the world in its desperate blindness and need, and show that all its problems, social, economic, national, and international, are already solved in the mind of Christ.

For this cause were the Free Churches born: for this cause they live today. This is our vocation, to manifest the "power of the world to come", to reveal the heavenly wisdom, to call the world and show it the way to Christ's new world order, to His eternal order.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

HOW A UNION WORKS—A WARNING FROM METHODISM

THE purpose of this article is to indicate the danger that besets the person having an eirenic mind who is confronted by Schemes of Union in the ecclesiastical realm as we know it, however tenacious be his hold upon principles. By examining certain features of Methodist Union from the Primitive Methodist point of view it may be that facts will emerge which have not been generally recognized.

The 113th, and last, Primitive Methodist Conference met in June, 1932. Under the title *Lest We Forget*, the *Aldersgate Magazine* published "Commemoration Addresses" delivered at the Conference. In that of Dr. W. L. Wardle, who was destined to become a President of the united Church, we read:

> We have always been proud of our freedom. Never within my memory has there been a successful heresy hunt within our borders. And when we count on carrying with us into the union that sense of freedom we do not think of ourselves as false to the Methodist traditions. John Wesley, though he was too great a man to be formally consistent in his utterances, often boasted of the catholicity of Methodism. He proudly contrasted Methodists with other churches who insisted on doctrinal or ceremonial tests. "Methodists alone", he said, "think and let think".

In 1931 the Hartley Lecture had contained this statement:

> A formal acceptance of the scheme of doctrine has never been demanded from members of the Church. Those who occupy the position of preachers are obliged to give their views on these statements, but literal acceptance is seldom demanded. This practice will be carried forward into the new Methodist Church. Enlightened conviction of Christianity as truth of life, and consecrated loyalty to Jesus Christ Himself, are regarded as of more importance than meticulous conformity to a scheme of doctrine.

So early as 1924, in a Methodist Union Supplement to the *Primitive Methodist Leader*, Dr. A. S. Peake, who was undoubtedly the central figure within his own denomination, gave this assurance:

> Many still feel difficulty about the doctrinal statement. What has been in mind on the one side has been to secure an element of continuity and justify our claim to be the heirs of the Methodist witness. On the other side we have steadily kept in mind the vital necessity of securing adequate liberty of thought and expression. I would point out to Primitive Methodists apprehensive of obscurantist tyranny that their fears are ungrounded.

The initiative in the matter of Methodist Union was taken by the Wesleyan Conference in 1913. The *Holborn Review*, in the following April, contained an article by the Rev. F. J. Sainty on "The True Basis of Church Membership". There are passages which might, if wrested from their context, imply that he desired to make attendance at the Lord's Supper a test of membership rather than what was, he said, nominally the test—class-meeting attendance. He went so far as to say:

> It is high time we made more of the Lord's Supper, which is a divinely-ordained institution. We know of no body of Christians, claiming the prerogatives of a Church as we do, that makes so little of the ordinance.

Nevertheless, he quoted with approval Dr. Dale's saying that "A Christian society which imposes any other conditions of membership than faith in Christ is a sect, and not, in the highest sense of the term, a Christian Church". And he asked (note the use here of the adjective "Christian"):

> Ought not a Christian Presbyterian or a Christian Congregationalist to be able immediately to unite with a Methodist Church, when circumstances throw them out of proximity to the Church of their choice, without any other test than that New Testament test of surrender to Christ and the desire to unite with His people, and vice versa?

In the years 1917 and 1918, the Primitive Methodist Conference having decided that the time was ripe for a revision of its Deed Poll, the *Holborn Review* gave space to articles on Creed Revision. Since the Rev. Jacob Walton was General Secretary of the Primitive Methodist Conference when Union came, it is interesting to note his view that the Sacraments should be excluded from a credal statement on the ground that "no Evangelical thinker maintains that participation in these rites is necessary to salvation". The Rev. W. R. Wilkinson, who later spent some years at the Book Room, and whose pawky humour and shrewd comments were often a joy to his friends, contributed this significant remark:

> Nothing provides such a rod as a creed. True, there is little room in the church courts of Primitive Methodism for the ecclesiast, but he may easily find a place in the days of federation for which some are working, and in that day, an elaborate creed may easily become a weapon of offence.

He went on to declare that a creed which affirms that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are of perpetual obligation, and so asserts what many do not regard as either biblical or true, was a long way from being the Church's belief.

The Editor of the *Holborn Review* of that day was the Rev. J. Day Thompson, an ex-President of the Conference. In an address to a joint Fraternal Association of Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers (to be found in the *Holborn Review*, April 1918) he gave this account of views current in the Free Churches:

> Some of us are pretty well convinced that Jesus personally founded no Church—in our sense of the word—instituted no set Sacrament, laid down no Church Order.

Dr. A. S. Peake had become Editor when, in October 1920, a Wesleyan, the Rev. (now Dr.) A. W. Harrison, wrote on "The Doctrinal Standard of Methodism". He began by acknowledging that there had been "a certain measure of alarm expressed by United Methodists as well as by Primitive Methodists at the proposed statement concerning the doctrinal standard which is to be accepted by the reunited Methodist Church". He then laid it down that

> The Methodism of the future, if it is to have any vital future at all, must be at least as Catholic as the Methodism of the past and it would be a bad beginning for the new Union if the most liberal of its ministers were driven to seek other spheres of labour by the imposition of doctrinal standards which had been stumbling-blocks to some of our fathers before us. That such fears are groundless it is the purpose of the present article to suggest.

After a detailed survey of Wesley's Sermons and Notes on the New Testament he declared that there was no doubt that had Wesley

> been living today he would have recommended Dr. Peake's one volume commentary whole-heartedly to all his preachers, and might even have presented every one of them with a copy.

As for the old Wesleyan standards of doctrine, it might be gravely questioned whether any Church had had more reasonable liberty in belief. The writer proceeded to point out that the Church member had no doctrinal test to undergo. Why, then, should there be any doctrinal standard for the preachers which is not required for the people? That brought us, he said, face to face with the law of the land and questions of the tenure of property. In his Deed of Declaration (1784) Wesley provided a carefully-thought-out scheme by which the Methodist chapels might be used *in perpetuo* by preachers in connexion with the Conference and his societies and guaranteed continuity for the years to come. "It is to preserve this continuity", the argument proceeded, "and to conform to the conditions on which Wesleyan trusts are used that a reference to standards of doctrine is necessary in any new instrument that may be prepared for the Methodist Church of the future". In conclusion Dr. Harrison averred that

> the needs of the time are so great and the value of simple evangelical Christianity so manifest that we must not fashion for ourselves standards of belief which will make it impossible for anyone who has the Spirit of Jesus to join in our work.

In 1920 also the United Committee of the three Churches reported:

> It is agreed by all that if Union is to be accomplished it must be upon such comprehensive lines that all the various types of thought and temperament represented in the existing denominations could find a home in the united Church.

The Primitive Methodist Conference of 1929, in its reply to the Report of the Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in August 1927, spoke deliberately concerning the position of the Sacraments in the Church Universal:

> Much as we value such a sacrament as that of the Lord's Supper, we are convinced that there are other ways, which some souls find not less efficacious, by which Christ communicates His saving grace. We should regret, therefore, if observance of the Sacraments was made so indispensable to membership in the united Church that such a community as the Society of Friends could be allowed no place therein.

Had Primitive Methodists been approached in any other way than that which the foregoing passages indicate, their votes for Union would have

been solicited in vain. Such only was the language by which they, at first hesitant and suspicious, were familiarized with the Scheme of Union, and led to believe that it involved no break with their tradition of freedom. The selection made here of public utterances is representative. It would be easy to multiply examples. But need we labour the point? For in the Minutes of the Uniting Conference the note persists:

> Membership is not conditional upon the profession of theological tenets, nor dependent upon traditional authority or ecclesiastical ritual. It is based upon a personal experience of the Lord Jesus Christ, wrought by His Spirit, ranging from the earliest manifestations of Divine grace in the soul to its crowning blessedness in the joy of perfect love, and upon the sharing of such personal gifts of grace with others seeking or enjoying a like experience.

But what followed immediately upon these assertions? This: In December 1932 each member found printed on the back of the Ticket of Membership bearing his name two paragraphs:

1. All persons are welcomed into membership in the Methodist Church who sincerely desire to be saved from their sins through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and evidence the same in life and conduct, and who seek to have fellowship with Christ Himself and His people by taking up the duties and privileges of the Methodist Church.
2. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments of Divine appointment and of perpetual obligation. As membership in the Church also involves fellowship, it is the duty of all members to seek to cultivate this in every possible way. The weekly Class Meeting has proved the most effective means of maintaining among Methodists true fellowship in Christian experience. All members must have their names entered on a Class Book, be placed under the pastoral care of a Class Leader, and receive a Quarterly Ticket of Membership.

The printing was repeated in December 1933. But by the following December the first sentence of paragraph 2 had disappeared. Instead there was the statement that

> It is the privilege and duty of Members of The Methodist Church to avail themselves of the two sacraments namely Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

We shall indicate why that change was made. Meanwhile we put to the reader the vital question: What does acceptance of such a Class-ticket, in either form, imply?

The question was answered by an unsuspecting Methodist lecturer in a parish hall not long ago. He was the Rev. Irvonwy Morgan, B.A., whose student days were, we believe, not over when the events we have described were happening, and the occasion was an inter-denominational group discussion, where the Anglo-Catholic Vicar took the chair whilst the speaker expounded the Methodist view of the Reformation. Since these discussions were to lead up to a final talk on the difficulties in the way of Christian unity, it will be appreciated that the way was open for interrogation. "Is attendance at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a test of membership in the Methodist Church?" Mr. Morgan was asked. He had no manner of doubt on the subject. His affirmation was emphatic. Why—and he even laughed at the absurdity of the question!—on the back of the Class-ticket was to be found . . . ! He was perfectly satisfied that it should be so. An attempt to enlighten him in the sense of this article was not a success.

Nobody could have had any right to give pledges was his retort. The Conference must always be supreme. As for Dr. Peake, "He is in heaven, so he knows better now".

Not that we quarrel with Mr. Morgan's verdict on the Class-ticket. We have never yet been able to understand how the contrary view can with honesty be maintained by anybody who carefully weighs the situation. Surely acceptance of it implies an affirmation that, as we have shown, many Methodists are not prepared to make. How, then, can they be holders of such a document and not be compromised by it? Those who decline to give such personal application to so essentially personal a document degrade a fine tradition. Nevertheless, Mr. Morgan cannot claim official backing for his view. The reason why is also the explanation of the facility with which many have been able to conceal from themselves the real issue. For example, it was possible for an elderly ex-Primitive Methodist minister of undoubted integrity to protest in the *British Weekly*, late in 1933:

> Attendance at the Sacrament has never been made a test of membership, and the conditions of continuing in membership are as follows: Any member who without sufficient reason persistently absents himself from the Lord's Supper, and from the meetings for Christian fellowship, shall be visited both by his leader and his minister. The names of any who by such prolonged absence sever themselves from Church membership shall be removed by the leaders' meeting.

Those conditions were taken from the Basis of Membership. So, indeed, are the two paragraphs which still appear on the December Class-ticket. It is only when the latter are read alone that they imply, contrary to the obvious effect of the Basis of Membership clause of the Deed of Union as a whole, that membership necessarily involves observance of the sacraments. We hold that they were selected for printing with the intention of creating that impression. Dr. Bond has, however, dissented from this interpretation of the action taken, holding that it is not meant to debar those who hold the Quaker view of the Sacraments from membership of the Methodist Church. "Very well", rejoined a correspondent in the columns of the *Methodist Times and Leader*,

> it will be understood that so long as those two paragraphs only appear on the Class-ticket I shall maintain my right to membership, but I shall attend no Sacrament of the Lord's Table observed under the auspices of the Methodist. Perhaps my action will facilitate that clearer definition of the terms of membership that your correspondent . . . desires; but meanwhile I commend to the thought of your readers the fact that the men from whom the proposal to print an arbitrary selection from the Basis of Membership comes are precisely those who have been surprised in the act of violating the Deed of Union. Their purpose first and last has been the same.

Reader, you have been warned! Methodist Union has worked like that; not because of accident or misunderstanding, but because some Free Church ministers of the Gospel deliberately planned that it should. They did not advertise their purpose, for Methodist Union was meant to be only a beginning. They have conceded nothing to appeals on moral grounds, and very ungraciously did they yield to legal requirements. And so, now that other voices are being raised, calling upon us in God's name to further reunion of the Churches—or to a renunciation of our independency—and the old assurances are being poured forth with sinister reiteration, does it not behove us to beware? One thing is crystal clear. It is the sacerdotalist who will rule the so-called Church Catholic should it take shape as the result of the movements of our day.

A. E. HARPER

A WARLESS WORLD

[I have in mind in this article three kinds of people: (1) People who are fond of saying "never", when it is suggested that something good and great can be done; (2) people who say "never till": you will never do this, that, or the other till Christ comes, or till human nature is changed, *etc., etc.;* (3) people who, when some machinery is set up, say like a League of Nations, damn it with faint praise, who are too apt to use the little word "but".]

In thinking—as I have often done during the last thirty years or so—about the above subject I have found it helpful and necessary to distinguish in my mind between a warless world—a world free from war, though not free from problems and disputes—and a world at peace as we Christians understand peace: all men and nations possessing the peace as God in Christ gives peace, and all therefore men and women of goodwill, led and controlled by the spirit of love. There must be myriads of people throughout the world even now who are men and women of goodwill, who say that they do not want such a thing as war, but that it comes somehow in spite of them. These know that it is a most clumsy and indeed a most brutal method of settling (?) disputes that arise from time to time between nations. On the other hand, we are bound to admit that there are others who are not so disposed, who maintain that war with material weapons is such an ancient institution that it will remain as long as time. They will admit that it is brutal and unreasonable, but they are not convinced that anything can be done about it, or that another way is possible. But the question that arises in my mind is this. Is it not possible to make a warless world without tarrying for a world of men and women who are reasonable, amiable, and really virtuous and wise? I am inclined, rightly or wrongly, to answer the question in the positive, that it is possible, that it is not necessary to wait for a warless world until all, let us say, return to God, and so allow Him to rule their lives. Such a world of course is desirable, and the attempt must be made to make it, to evangelize mankind; but such a world is not as yet possible—a world consisting of men and women who are altogether and fully eager to know and do the will of God.

Let me illustrate by a question. Did those who abolished chattel slavery say to themselves before starting the campaign against the ancient evil: "We shall not be able to abolish this thing till every man in all the civilized countries is a true and thorough Christian, till every man is soundly converted, till every man is able to say: 'I have accepted peace as God gives peace' "? There is to my mind only one answer. "That thing", as Lincoln called it, *was* abolished, though all men and women were not by any means paragons of virtue. In short: they made a slaveless society without tarrying for the city all of gold, without tarrying for that for which we still pray—the complete reign of God on earth. I have heard men proclaim—and there has been some applause—that we shall never get rid of war until all men and women are in the kingdom of God, and I have found myself saying: "That kind of talk is exceedingly discouraging, though it pleases those who want an additional excuse for sitting back and folding arms". While it is possible to over-simplify the problem of war, it is also possible to magnify it, so that people come to the conclusion that it is really and forever impossible to find a solution. People who speak like that, who say, "Unless this or that is done, till all are pacifists, *etc.*", mean to be realistic, but in fact they are not; for the truth, or so it seems to me, is that a warless world can be created without waiting for all that these people have in mind. I grant, as I must

grant, that the world will be more Christian when war is abolished than it was before, just as society was more Christian—in its legislation anyhow—when chattel slavery, duelling, child labour were abolished; for in a sub-Christian world people are *apt* at least to conduct their lives in a sub-Christian way. Some indeed go so far as to say that people, whoever they are, are bound to be sub-Christian in their conduct as long as the society in which they live and work is sub-Christian. Indeed Dr. A. N. Whitehead has said something of the sort:

> The progress of humanity can be defined as the process of transforming society so as to make the original Christian ideals increasingly practicable for its individual members. As society is now constituted a literal adherence to the moral precepts scattered throughout the Gospels would mean sudden death.

When, therefore, we attempt to abolish war we *are* transforming society, and so relieving the tension that is in the mind of all decent people, and *this can be done without waiting for a perfect world, or waiting for a world consisting of men and women who will satisfy the idealists.* This is perhaps what people have in mind when they speak of the Christian community—if it can be found in a sub-Christian society—and a community of Christians. And, after all, there are men who are more Christian than others, men who are trying to be Christians and men who are not trying very much, or very hard. But we must leave that question, for all I want to stress in this brief article is the possibility of making a warless world without waiting for, say, the Millennium. The Millennium, if we are not mistaken, is far away, but the warless world is not far away; at any rate it need not be if we realize that it can be made ere the world is full of reasonable and knowledgeable people, people with the flame of freedom in their souls and the light of knowledge in their eyes. And shall we not help people by saying this in season and out of season? I feel perfectly certain that we shall, and constrain them also to plan and work for a warless world. Many people today speak—and they speak helpfully, I think—of limited objectives. Is not a warless world one of these objectives, and is not a limited objective something that can be reached, and reached before that which is perfect is reached or realized? I am not eager to cool the ardour and to kill the desire of any who pant after the perfect, but it is well to realize that the intermediate stages must be passed ere the perfect ideal is realized. Neither am I suggesting that the making of a warless world will be easy, that we can afford to take the line of least resistance in the matter—accept or take the easy way out—but I do suggest that it is possible and that it can be achieved before all men are what they ought to be, sons of God. We cannot save men by act of Parliament, *i.e.*, save them as Christians understand salvation, but law can restrain: we *can outlaw* war, and I believe we shall outlaw war long before that glorious day when God shall be all in all. It is not my purpose here to write about the way in which it will be done—that is another matter, and I am not dealing with it—my purpose is to point out as clearly as I know how, that we need not wait for the perfect state of things ere we make the attempt. In *True Humanism* Jacques Maritain quotes a saying by Charles Péguy: "The social revolution will be moral or it will be nothing". Maritain quotes the saying with approval, but he points out that it can be entirely misunderstood, and therefore he tries to explain it:

> It does not mean that before a reform of the social order can be made effective all men must first be converted to virtuous living. Interpreted in that way, the saying would be merely a pharisaical pretext

> for avoiding any effort at social reform. Revolutions are the work of comparatively small groups of men who devote all their energies to the task: it is to these men that the words of Péguy are addressed.

This confirms, I believe, all that I have tried to say about the difference between a warless world and a world in which all men are "converted to virtuous living" or converted to the way and method of Christ, "the more excellent way", as Paul calls it. And Maritain continues:

> His (Péguy's) meaning is: you can only transform the social order of the modern world by effecting at the same time and first of all within your own soul a renewal of moral and spiritual life: by digging down to the moral and spiritual foundations of human existence, and reviving the moral ideas that govern the life of the social body as such; and by awakening a new impulse in the secret sources of its being.

This, it seems to me, is a true description of real peacemakers. They contest for peace and they are in peace—as far as that is possible in a world where such a thing as war is being waged—they endeavour to outlaw war. They do not, of course, forget their duty to men who have not digged down to the moral and spiritual foundations of human existence, to men who have not found peace in the will of God, but they do realize that now is the time to plan and work for a warless world, and that this limited objective can be reached ere all men are—and to use the words again—"converted to virtuous living". These peacemakers should not despair, they should read again the story of the Abolitionists, the story of all great reformers, and take courage. Men will not be scared by limited objectives as they are scared when ultimate objectives are presented to them, and they will not be able to find a pretext for not working for them; they will say, these objectives are realizable and so we will work until they are reached.

If I were asked, What do you visualize, what is in your mind, when you say, "Thy will be done on earth" or when you say, "Thy kingdom come"?, I should not find it easy to answer off-hand, and I am certain that many others would not find it easy. I could, of course, answer in this vague way: "When I pray 'Thy will be done on earth' or 'Thy kingdom come', I am asking that God will extend His healing reign over the spirits of men". But as I said, this answer is vague and indefinite, and therefore the question, "What exactly are you expecting, what in outline and in detail are you asking for?" would be reiterated. Well, there are many things, but one thing is always in my mind: it is a warless world, and a world too—and I hasten to say this—where "peace" has been made romantic and heroic, where men have found a moral and spiritual alternative for war with material weapons. This is one of the limited objectives. I cannot "see the distant scene"; I can only see sections, instalments, of the kingdom of God; I see that sections of it have been built, so to speak, in the past, and I see that sections of it are being built and will be built in these days in which we live, that is, if we faint not, if we refuse to know despair. It is sometimes asked "whether world progress in social, economic, and international relations is or is not a worthy standard by which the success of Christianity may be measured, and whether a right estimate of the value of utopian ideals is or is not a good means of setting forth the Kingdom of God". Why not? Does not the fact of "world progress in social, economic, and international relations" prove two things (*a*) that God is still at work ("my Father worketh hitherto"), and (*b*) that men in themselves are making progress, *i.e.*, becoming more sensitive, defining more clearly what is meant by the kingdom of God? And besides, are they not bringing out the implications of the Gospel which they have heard when

they insist that "world progress in social, economic, and international relations" should be made? E. M. Forster, in the symposium, *I Believe,* quotes a saying by Jacopone da Todi: "O thou who lovest me, set this love in order", and continues:

> Not by becoming better, but by ordering and distributing his native goodness, will man shut up force into its box, and so gain time to explore the universe and to set his mark upon it worthily.

There is much goodwill in the world, but it must be organized; there is much love, but it must be expressed in legislation, *etc.;* there are great ideas in the minds of men—castles in the air—but they must be embodied in policies so that the strain which is upon men's conscience shall be relieved, and the tensions in their minds be removed. In brief, the truth of man's love must be brought into action (organized) as a creative force. According to their light and opportunity the "famous men" who lived before us and whom we praise, did bring man's love into action: they did right wrongs; they did reach limited objectives, and are we not challenged to do so in these days, *i.e.,* bring our love into action? It is true that the eye of faith is dim; it is true that we cannot see far ahead, but we do see in outline at least the things that should be on the earth in the future—in the near future. Prof. Gilbert Murray's *The Ordeal of this Generation* says:

> Surely we want, both as individuals and as a community, to pursue that quest for the attainment or the creation of "a good life for man"; we want to get to that work unhindered and uncrippled, and therefore, apart from other reasons, we need above all things peace.

Yes, we do need a warless world, and why not believe that it is possible, why not believe that we can build afresh out of new materials the unattained Cosmos of *our* "desire", our limited objective?

And now to sum up: (1) Though there may be strife and problems in the world, there need not be war with material weapons; the problems can be dealt with in another way, by argument and discussion. (2) There must be added to a kindly disposition, thought; for a kindly disposition—and there is much of it—is not enough: each citizen must say in the words of William Blake: "I will not cease from mental fight", must realize that he is responsible, must cease saying, What are *they* going to do? and learn to say, What shall *we* do, together? In short, he must see that even if everyone were a Christian the social and international problems would remain, calling for deep thought for their solution: not even a Christian spirit can be a substitute for thought, for that for which mind was given to men and women. (3) We must try again. Everyone will know what I mean by this: though we have failed in the past, that is no reason why we should not try again.

Finally: our resources. Here I will take the liberty of using the words of Dr. Micklem in *The Theology of Politics:*

> The philosopher starts from the manifold and complex data of the senses and comes, or hopes to come, at the end of his reasonings to unity and simplicity and God. The theologian moves in the opposite direction, he starts from God and descends to see all the manifold of the universe in God. In these days when we are likely to be overwhelmed with the complexities and entanglements and confusion of international politics, it is refreshing and hope-restoring to consider the testimony of the theologian, because, while he offers no immediate solution of our difficulties, he suggests that we have all the moving forces of the universe on our side when we work for international order.

JOHN DAVIES.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

CRICKET NOTES.

It was a very dull day in December, and the Committee was even duller than the weather. Suddenly there came a hoarse whisper from my neighbour, "When are you going to give us some more cricket in the *Quarterly*?" That explains why we win through: December gloom, a lackadaisical and somnolent committee, a world at war—and our thoughts turn to the greatest of games played in the sunshine of peaceful days.

That irrelevant query did me a world of good. I had just made a decision which would mean missing an English spring and a summer's cricket—and no part of the world can match either—and my neighbour's interest served to lighten the gloom. So it is that on a February day I am responding to his request—though in all frankness I must confess I am writing largely for my own pleasure—even though these words will not be read until the end of June, when I expect to be 6,000 miles away.

Two other things have stimulated me to write at this moment. The first is E. H. D. Sewell's attempt to select the best English XI, the players to be taken when they were at their best. This challenges all cricket fans, and I mean to have a shot at it, limiting the choice to men whom I have myself seen play—roughly players of this century. Here then is my XI in the order of batting:

1. Hobbs.
2. Sutcliffe.
3. Hammond.
4. Leyland.
5. Jackson.
6. Hirst.
7. Jessop.
8. Rhodes.
9. Lilley.
10. Barnes.
11. Richardson.

There is an XI which would take some beating on any wicket. They bat down to No. 9; in Richardson and Barnes you have two of the best opening bowlers the world has known, in Hirst the best swerve bowler, and in Rhodes the best left-arm slow bowler. And if these should fail, Jackson, Hammond, Leyland, and Jessop are all capable of getting wickets and breaking up a partnership.

But what glorious players are left out! Here are two teams which would give them a good game:

1. Grace.	1. Fry.
2. McLaren.	2. Hayward.
3. Tyldesley (J. T.).	3. Mitchell (A.).
4. Ranjitsinhji.	4. Woolley.
5. Paynter.	5. Foster (R. E.).
6. Verity.	6. Ames.
7. Tate.	7. Kilner.
8. Larwood.	8. Jones (A. O.).
9. Macaulay.	9. Haigh.
10. Lockwood.	10. Blythe.
11. Duckworth.	11. Brearley.

In these teams I am loth to leave out J. T. Hearne, one of the finest off-break bowlers the game has known. Was there ever a bowler who maintained a length for longer spells?

Of course, in a sense I am so far only playing at the game, for in my heart of hearts I know—like any other Yorkshireman—that if we meant business there would be no need to look beyond the county—the only trouble is the embarrassment of riches when more than one generation is available. Here is my XI which I would back against the rest of the world:

1. Tunnicliffe.
2. Sutcliffe.
3. Denton.
4. Leyland.
5. Jackson.
6. Hirst.
7. Kilner.
8. Rhodes.
9. Emmott Robinson.
10. Wood.
11. Haigh (or Macaulay).

What a match it would be between that Yorkshire XI and this Rest:

1. Hobbs or Fry.
2. Grace, McLaren or Hayward.
3. Hammond.
4. Paynter.
5. Ranjitsinhji.
6. Woolley.
7. Jessop.
8. Lilley.
9. Tate, Briggs or Blythe.
10. Barnes.
11. Richardson.

That Yorkshire XI, be it noted, leaves out one of the finest cricketers the game has known, and one whom we shall see no more, for Hedley Verity died of wounds in an Italian prison camp on 31 July last. I have just received a booklet recording his career from 1930 to 1939, with appreciations by Sir Pelham Warner and Herbert Sutcliffe. And what a career it is! Top of the English bowling averages in his first year, taking all 10 wickets against Warwickshire and playing for Players and for England in his second; 10 wickets for 10 against Notts and in the England XI to Australia in his third—and so on, including 17 wickets for 91 in one day against Essex, and 15 wickets (14 in one day) against the Australians at Lord's. His best all-round season was 1936, when he took 216 wickets for 13.18 runs and scored 855 for an average of 31.66. He followed his mentor Wilfred Rhodes in batting No. 1 for England after batting No. 11, and in his duel with Bradman he was ten times successful, only Grimmett having the like record.

Verity was shot at the head of his men, and his last words to them were "Keep going". He was said to be an even better soldier than he was a cricketer; that means his standard was high indeed. I have known no cricketer who *thought* so much about the game: it was to him a calling, and it was his duty to make himself proficient in it. Not that he was not wrong sometimes; I remember talking to him one morning before the beginning of the game at Leyton. He had been bowling at the nets and trying out a ball he rarely used—faster than usual, going in with his arm, and then

whipping back. He had bowled this very well, and he remarked, "I'm sorry we've won the toss. I'd like to bowl on this wicket: there'll be some wickets falling before lunch". And then Holmes and Sutcliffe went in, batted all day and part of the next and broke all records!

Another time at Lord's he was certainly right. At the beginning of the second day's play against Middlesex I asked him, "Are you going to finish them off today?", and he replied, "Well, we've paid our hotel bills on the strength of it!" The conceit of these Yorkshiremen! Or is it only the superb confidence of those who are masters of their job? There was no need for them to return to their hotel.

Verity was a Congregationalist, and a remarkably good influence wherever he went. In the last innings he bowled—against Sussex at Brighton—he took 7 wickets for 9 runs in 6 overs. When congratulated he said, "I wonder if I shall ever bowl here again". He will not, but he has played a good game.

* * *

There is always a sadness about one's last game of the season, especially in war-time when one is getting old. Such thoughts were not far away from my mind when the committee query reached me—for now we are descending from the eagles to the kites and crows. I remember how after the last game I played in 1943 I wondered if I should ever play again. Fortunately it was a game to remember. Just before the tea interval I split a finger taking a sharp return, and had to go off for a bandage. We expected a declaration, for the score was 150 for 8, but our opponents went in again. Asked to resume bowling, I made a discovery: a bandage on the end of the third finger is a decided advantage for a leg-break bowler. The two wickets fell to me, making my analysis into a respectable 6 for 39. When we went in, with scarcely enough time, we were carried by our No. 1, who made a magnificent dashing 94. I had hopes of staying with him, but then 9 was bowled trying to pull a straight ball (fool!) which kept low. The winning hit was scored with 9 wickets down from the last ball but one of the last over, and the last ball of the match took the last wicket. What can you want better than that?

But shall I ever play again? Sixty in sight, and, as far as cricket is concerned, this summer wasted for me. Still, one can always umpire. I remember once trying to get together a Ministers' XI to play one of our Schools. One sportsman wrote telling me he was very keen and would like to play—and then added a *PS.*: "Perhaps I'd better umpire. I'm 76".

ALBERT PEEL.

PS. I am told that to complete this article I should add my 20th-century Australian XI. Here it is:

1. Trumper.
2. Woodfull.
3. Bradman.
4. Clem Hill.
5. Ponsford.
6. Noble.
7. J. M. Gregory.
8. Oldfield.
9. Trumble.
10. Grimmett.
11. Macdonald.

If to play in Australia I should probably put Mailey in, perhaps for Ponsford, though of course he would not bat No. 5!

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Christian Philosophy of History. By SHIRLEY J. CASE. Chicago & Cambridge University Presses. 12s.

Three Russian Prophets. By NICOLAS ZERNOV. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

Slavery and Freedom. By NICOLAS BERDYAEV. Bles. 25s.

Here are three books, one by an American, two by Russians, which every student of religion ought to read. We put the shortest first, partly because it is probably the most important, and partly because a reader who started with *Slavery and Freedom* might be too exhausted to tackle the others. Barthian College Principals who desire their students to become voices and not echoes should make Prof. Shirley J. Case's book compulsory reading. The sections—"The Challenging World", "The Providential View of History", "The Human View of History", "The Revival of Historical Dualism", "The Continuity of History", "The Religious Significance of History", and "God and the Historical Process"—will suggest to the reader the amount of ground covered and even the direction of the argument. We cannot decide whether Prof. Case is more useful in his survey of the way mankind has regarded history, in his estimate of the cult of crisis, or in his reminder that "in the excitement of the moment we may forget the heritage of wisdom and experience bequeathed to us by the past". It is good to find a scholar with such wide knowledge and keen insight concluding that

> History proves to be a tonic, not a sedative. God is discovered working within history, where he has willed that man should learn to be the efficient instruments of the divine energy.

But who was "Archbishop" Wilberforce?

The first thing that must be noted about Dr. Zernov's new and important book is the excellence of its style: whether it was written in English or translated, it is a notable achievement. Dr. Zernov's prophets are Khomiakhov, Dostoevsky, and Soloviev, each of whom had as "tutor and guide" the Orthodox Church, "so often described in the West as obsolete and superstitious". The future of civilization, he declares, depends on the acceptance or rejection of the vision of the Church seen by these three.

Probably for a hundred English readers who know Dostoevsky, not more than ten know Soloviev, and not more than two Khomiakhov, and yet in some ways the last-named is the most attractive of the three. And even the keenest Dostoevsky enthusiasts will hesitate to accept Dr. Zernov's estimate of

> one of the greatest novelists the world has known, one of the most original psychologists of all times, . . . a mystic whose utterances about God and man equal in significance any ever made by a Christian thinker.

Dr. Zernov's exposition serves as a reminder that there is much in the witness of the Orthodox Church which harmonizes with that of the Free

Churches. It believes in freedom—the freedom so many Christians are afraid to face because they are sinners and have to face the Living God, and so they forsake "that unique type of fellowship life which was experienced by its early members" and change it into a powerful institution: they have no confidence in the freedom the guidance of the Spirit gives and prefer "to entrust their safety to the protection of a well-constructed boat rather than risk other less usual ways of crossing the sea of life". Unhappily, just when our hearts are warming to Dr. Zernov's thesis he begins to limit his conceptions and to make the true function of the Church nothing more than "the uniting its members round the celebration of the Holy Eucharist . . . the divinely-appointed medicine for sin and corruption". But the book is one to be read, and from it all may learn much.

If Dr. Zernov is a pleasure to read, Dr. Berdyaev is a discipline. It is not only that he quotes authorities unfamiliar to most English readers—how many readers of this journal know anything of Byely, Tönnies, Nyesmyelov, Bachofen or are acquainted with "the extreme universalism of Spann" (no, frivolous reader, it is not "Spam"): he also uses a language peculiar to himself ("When I say 'heresy', he declares, 'I am not speaking my own language"), which is a Cassino needing intensive bombardment before the way to the meaning becomes clear. And there is no way of by-passing it, so the reader must go in for Commando training, and then he can face "pagan cosmocentricity" (nothing to do with the late Archbishop of Canterbury), "Kataphatic", and any other obstacle. Yet Dr. Berdyaev *can* write simply when he chooses:

> The totalitarian state itself wishes to be a church, to organize the souls of men, to exercise dominion over souls, over conscience and thought, and to leave no room for freedom of spirit, for the sphere of the Kingdom of God.

Contrast on the next page:

> The prince of this world is at the extreme limit of the objectivization, the exteriorization and the alienation of human nature.

Dr. Berdyaev says this book embodies his "whole way of looking at life as a philosopher"; it surveys his philosophical pilgrimage and outlines the conception of personality he has come to hold supreme. It is probable that he does not know the work of the leading exponent of a personalist philosophy in the United States, the veteran Congregational Professor, Dr. John Wright Buckham, which is a pity, for the American can give the Russian points in exposition. "Man, human personality", it is maintained,

> is the supreme value, not the community, not collective realities which belong to the object world, such as society, nation, state, civilization, church. . . . [It] is more primary than being . . . the entire image of man in which the spiritual principle has the mastery over all the powers of man's soul and body. . . . Duality exists, not between soul and body, but between spirit and nature, between freedom and necessity. Personality is the victory of the spirit over nature, of freedom over necessity.

To Dr. Berdyaev, therefore, the "nigger in the wood-pile", the villain of the piece, is "objectivization"—the word must occur scores, perhaps hundreds, of times (*cf.* 245: "Objectivization is the concealment of revelation" and "Man loses himself in objectivization"; 251: "In the objectivized world, all values are perverted")—which is the deadly enemy of the "existential".

The scheme of the book, after examinations of the concepts of personality, slavery, and freedom, is to take those things to which man is enslaved and discuss them in turn. Thus we have the slavery of man to Being, to God, to Nature, to Society, to Civilization, to Himself, to Sovereignty, to War, to Nationalism, to Aristocracy, to Property and Money, to Revolution, to Collectivism, to Sex, to Beauty, Art, and Culture, to Fear and Death, and to History.

It will be seen that here is the widest scope, and the reader may find himself often challenged to thought, even to action, and frequently to discussion and disagreement. Always Dr. Berdyaev goes below the surface, though we imagine many will ponder long before accepting his exposition of the words:

> World harmony is a false and an enslaving idea. One must get free from it for the sake of the dignity of personality.

And the outcome of it all? Perhaps it may be found in the statements:

> But God is not world providence, that is to say not a ruler and sovereign of the universe, not *pantokrator*. God is freedom and meaning, love and sacrifice. He is struggle against the objectivized world order.

Francis Cardinal Bourne. By ERNEST OLDMEADOW. Burns, Oates. Vol. 1 16s. Vol. 2 18s.

There has been a long interval between the appearance of the two volumes of this biography, but it will be as well to follow up the notice of Vol. I written on publication by a note about its successor, for what was written applies to both volumes.

Mr. Oldmeadow, like many converts before him, loses no chance to draw attention to himself in order to show the reality of his conversion, and in this book we have far too much of the biographer. Indeed, we have far too much of the book also, for there are many superfluous pages—about Mohammed Ali, the architecture of buildings with which the Cardinal was connected, and (half a dozen of them) the celebration of the 13th centenary of the landing of Augustine in England. All this could have been overlooked had we been given an objective account of Francis Bourne's life and work. Instead we have an overgrown pamphlet in which the central place is occupied by the education controversy, where Birrell is a Unitarian and the villains of the piece are "Free" Churchmen—the quotation marks themselves show the spirit in which Mr. Oldmeadow writes, as do his references to John Wesley's "fly-away mind" and "his famous but abler and finer brother Charles". The reader may wonder what the Wesleys are doing in a biography of Cardinal Bourne, but he will have the same wonder about many things he finds! Mr. Oldmeadow cannot spell "guerrilla" and he thinks there has been no biography of Campbell-Bannerman.

Vol. II opens with journalistic accounts of journeys abroad ("the town band got in plenty of 'God Save the King' ", and so forth) and a violent attack on E. D. Morel, and ends with a long account of the Malines Conversations in which the late Lord Halifax is pictured as thoroughly untrustworthy. Between we have descriptions of the many controversies in which Bourne became involved—for "the Quiet Cardinal", as Mr. Oldmeadow loves to call him, there seem an amazing number of them. We have the same unhappy picture of jealousies and schemings and wire-pulling in the Roman Church as we have in Vol. II of Purcell's *Manning*. And whatever can be meant by the reference (1928) "the Catholics who had suffered and died for the Mass throughout three hundred years"? Again there is much irrelevant matter, but as an indication that we have ploughed through it all

we may mention "pleasuance" on p. 298 and "authorative" on p. 407. At the end of it we cannot conclude that Cardinal Bourne was big enough to deserve a two-volume *Life* or that Mr. Oldmeadow is a good biographer.

EDITOR.

The Christian Sacrifice. By EUGENE MASURE. Translated by Illtyd Trethowan, O.S.B. Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 15s.

Canon Eugene Masure is described as Director of the Grand Séminàire, Lille. His very interesting and learned work is essentially an attempt to modernize the Roman doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, while maintaining a strict adherence to the creeds and the official theology of the Church as stated in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. The modernization is effected by using the light which the comparative study of religion has thrown upon the institution of sacrifice: it is pointed out how this modern knowledge harmonizes with the statements about sacrifice found in the Fathers of the Church, for whom sacrifice was still a living institution and no mere museum piece. Amongst the Fathers, Augustine is regarded as summing up all the rest; while in the Middle Ages St. Thomas Aquinas is said to have faithfully maintained Augustine's teaching.

Canon Masure begins by recurring to the statement of St. Thomas that "sacrifice" means literally "a making sacred". The essential principle of the action is that something is handed over to God, while at the same time it is given up by the worshipper: the time-honoured names for these two aspects of the rite are 'oblation' and 'immolation' respectively. The purpose of the handing over at the painful cost of surrender is that God may accept the gift and return it to the worshipper, fraught with Divine grace, as a means of communion with Himself: at this point sacrifice merges into sacrament. The whole movement takes place in man's liturgical approach to God, as it works through signs and symbols, which are not to be thought of as bare empty gestures, but as full of spiritual meaning and power.

In applying these ideas to the Eucharist, Canon Masure asserts as strongly as any Protestant that the primary and fundamental Christian sacrifice is that of Jesus Himself upon the Cross, as a historical act which took place once for all. The question then rises: What need was there for the further sacrifice in the Mass, which Trent declares is offered by the priest? Masure answers that there was need for the benefits of Christ's sacrifice to be applied to the individual; and this is done through the sacrament. But in order that the benefits may be really and truly appropriated, Christ's sacrifice must be brought near in the present; and that is what takes place through transubstantiation. There is in fact a double sacrifice in the Mass. The priest offers bread and wine, and God accepting the offering changes their substance to the body and blood of Christ, their outward appearance remaining unchanged. The priest then is enabled to offer Christ Himself as a victim, and God again accepts the sacrifice, giving back Christ's body and blood to be sacramentally consumed.

There is much more in "The Christian Sacrifice" than can be exhibited in a brief abstract. It is a very full book, with valuable insights into the nature of New Testament theology and into the complementary character of its different types of doctrine. A great deal of the book stands on the common ground where all Christians meet; and even what is peculiarly Roman may be said to have an œcumenical and irenic value in so far as it serves for the better understanding of what "the sacrifice of the Mass" means to a cultured and devout Romanist: what Canon Masure writes on this subject is so stated as to strike sympathetic chords even in one who is entirely opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Aristotle and Anglican Religious Thought. By VICTOR LYLE DOWDELL. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York. 1942. 15s. 6d.

The purpose of this work is to show the great influence of Aristotle on Anglican theology in all its stages and in the greater part of its representatives. Mr. Dowdell sees a close parallel between the *via media* of Anglicanism and Aristotle's use of the mean between excess and defect. The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer describes the method of the Church of England in ritual usage as one of keeping "the happy mean between too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting variations". Mr. Dowdell claims that what is here said with regard to Anglican ritual is true also of Anglican theology.

How is the influence of Aristotle on Anglican divinity to be proved? Mr. Dowdell answers: by induction. It is just as when one picks up pieces of flint and comes to recognize them as arrowheads A number are found and compared, and are then seen to be illustrations of the same thing in all stages: it is learned thereby what arrowheads really are. So it is necessary first to read Aristotle over and over, and then to read Anglican theology. In this way one catches the common look of ideas and phrases and even of whole treatises. From a variety of instances the essential parts stand out, and the judgment is formed, "Here is Aristotle".

Mr. Dowdell has worked in libraries, sometimes collecting his material at first hand from Aristotle and the Anglican divines, but also sometimes using and depending on the work of other observers who have been students of Aristotelianism or Anglican theology, or of both. He shows how from the Middle Ages onwards the study of Aristotle persisted at Oxford and Cambridge, and how the medieval scholastic method based on Aristotelian logic continued to rule Anglican thought; and this in spite of not infrequent protests against the dominance of Aristotle and the advent of new philosophies.

The issue of Mr. Dowdell's work may appear somewhat jejune. We are carried on from theologian to theologian, sometimes with only the briefest notice of the man and his work, and never with anything like a full study of any one thinker. In fact, what we get resembles a *catalogue raisonné* of Anglican Divines, where almost the most important thing about a theologian seems to be, How many times did he quote or at least refer to Aristotle? Mr. Dowdell compares the result of his inductive method to chips from a workshop; and he could not have hit upon any better simile by which to describe them.

Nevertheless, he has undoubtedly proved what he set out to prove; and if his work is in the end more of a survey than a study, it may well serve as the starting-point for many studies. There is a parallel to what he has done to be found in Biblical scholarship. The preliminary work in Biblical research may often be just a counting of instances, how many times such a word or phrase is used by this or that author; but finally great conclusions are found to turn on these seemingly meagre results. It is to be hoped that in a similar way something more may come of Mr. Dowdell's painstaking endeavours. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Spanish Now. By E. ALLISON PEERS. Methuen. 6s.

On the eve of education for all up to 18 years of age, Professor Peers makes out a case for Spanish as the *first* language to be taught in our schools. It is a case worth putting, though, when M. Josse speaks, what hearer can avoid an involuntary shiver of suspicion? The weakest part of the argument concerns politics and literature. A writer may today talk with indignation about 'atrocity stories'; but how is it that the carefully

documented pages of the Duchess of Atholl have never received any effective answer from supporters of the 'Caudillo'? And to claim that Spanish should be taught before French because it had admittedly a great influence on English letters in the 16th and 17th centuries is a hopeless argument; how infinitely closer were the links between French and English from 1500-1900!

French the Professor regards as one of the hardest of modern languages, though he is willing to make the concession that it 'cannot be surpassed as a *second* language for the intelligent child'. On the other hand he claims that Spanish, the language of over 100 millions of people and of 18 American nations, is an ideal one with which to begin. It is a pleasing surprise to find one page of the book giving rare praise to an experiment carried on through a series of years in our Northern Congregational School. 'Our *Sprachunterricht*', said Viëtor, when teaching in this country, 'is on the wrong track'. Is it? If anyone answers in the affirmative, let him read carefully these able, and, up to a certain point, convincing 120 pages.

SYDNEY H MOORE.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

The new volume of *The Speaker's Bible* (Aberdeen: Speaker's Bible Office, 11s. 6d.) is *Exodus*. It is edited by the Rev. E. Hastings, and the Introduction is by the Rev. N. H. Snaith. There are the usual features, and preachers giving courses on the Ten Commandments will find much useful comment.

We have to confess ourselves disappointed with Sir Herbert Grierson's *The English Bible* (Collins, 4s. 6d.), though the illustrations are beautifully produced. Even some of them—Ruskin's "Mountains above Lake Annecy", *e.g.*—do not seem very relevant, and Sir Herbert's choice of the literary figures influenced by the Bible—Milton, Bunyan, Byron, Ruskin—seems arbitrary, even when we recognize the limits imposed by space. "Whittington" for "Whittingham", "C. *J*. Montefioré", and "Nietsche" should have been avoided in a work of this kind.

The reception given to B. L. Manning's *A Layman in the Ministry* assures a welcome to its successor, *More Sermons of a Layman* (Independent Press, 6s.). Two of the sixteen sermons appeared in our own pages; many of the addresses were delivered in College Chapels during the last decade of Manning's too-short life; all reveal that intense faith and deep love for the great hymns of the Church which were among the main characteristics of Manning's life and witness.

In *The Prospects of Islam* (S.C.M., 6s.) Dr. Laurence E. Browne has given us a very readable sketch of the tenets, history, present position, and outlook of Muhammadanism. The first six of its nine chapters, delivered in the lectures at the University College of North Wales, are particularly useful.

Last year we noticed a volume of the addresses given by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman of New York during his six months' trip to Europe and North and South Africa. *Action This Day* (Sheed, 10s. 6d.) contains letters he sent home during the journey, which included Eire, Persia, Iran, Ethiopia—indeed so many countries that at times the letters can give little more than the ports of call and the names of the people met. The heavy schedule would have been quite impossible before the days of air travel, and there is little doubt that the Archbishop was enabled to carry comfort and inspiration to many. What remains in our mind after reading the

book is the consciousness of the loneliness and heroism of many missionaries, and notably the remark of the Sister nursing the dying lepers, "What a surprise and a joy to die and to wake up all clean!" One or two other sentences also linger—the pilot's "I don't mind losing my life, but I don't want to lose it for nothing", and a Bishop's desk motto, "Just because I am nice to you, please do not stay all morning". The Archbishop has an observant eye and a quick wit: in Uganda, hearing hens cackling, he used sign language to ask for an egg boiled four minutes; he was brought four eggs; "one of the eggs may have been fresh, but it was not the one I tried".

There have been so many accounts of the persecution of Christians under the Soviet *régime* that it is as well we have a statement on the other side. Unhappily the Rev. Stanley Evans's *Churches in the U.S.S.R.* (Cobbett, 5s.) is *ex parte* rather than judicial: it takes at their face value statements that the Constitution guarantees freedom of conscience and religious belief, and that "The holy word resounds freely in all our churches". Nevertheless it is of value in that it shows how intimately the Orthodox Church was bound up with the monarchical system, and in its account of the history of Churches other than the Orthodox during the last twenty-five years.

The American OWI is to be congratulated on its *Handbook of the United States of America* (Hutchinson, 10s. 6d.), which contains "Pertinent information about the United States and the war effort". While giving much space to the history of the war and the preparation therefor, the volume will serve as a book of reference on "the American way of life": constitution, education, culture, sport, press, radio, and a score of other subjects come within its purview, and there is a chronology down to February, 1943. We cannot refrain from summarizing a paragraph under "Navy", headed, "Wanted: One More 'Defeat' ":

> 12.5.42. Tokyo radio after the Coral Sea battle: "The Pacific Fleet is annihilated. America is reduced to a fourth-rate naval power".
>
> 21.8.42. Tokyo radio, after the first battle of the Solomons: "Wholesale destruction of the American Fleet . . . Anglo-American naval force reduced to that of a third-rate power".
>
> 29.10.42. Domei Agency, after Japanese retreat from the Solomons: "Again the Japanese Navy has proved its great superiority over the American Navy, which must now be considered a second-rate power".

There is a good deal in Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart's *Why Don't We Learn from History?* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.) which is both provocative and disturbing. We are told that military history is doctored both by commanders on the field and by subsequent historians; that Sir Douglas Haig deliberately deceived the War Cabinet and often deceived himself; that the hatreds of politicians for each other affect history more than moral principles do; that conscription is a mistake, as was the undertaking to Poland in 1939; and that the demand for unconditional surrender and the failure to leave a way open for retreat is a calamitous blunder. History has provided warnings, but they have been ignored, and similarly the Church has made needless difficulties for itself by its emphasis on the historical character and the uniqueness of the Christian revelation. On many points we find ourselves in agreement with Captain Liddell Hart, but there is a feeling of "all out of step but Jock" about the book which does not inspire confidence.

In *Judæa Lives Again* (Gollancz, 8s. 6d.) Mr. Norman Bentwich has given us an admirable sketch of the problem of Palestine. There is a full account of Zionism's striking achievement in the last 25 years—in agriculture, industry, communal life, and education, and an outline of the history

of the land under the mandate. The feud between Arab and Jew seems almost as intractable as that between Hindu and Moslem, but Mr. Bentwich believes it can be healed: some readers, we suspect, will be surprised at the figures he quotes to show that not only have the Arabs become more prosperous, especially those near the Jewish settlements, but their numbers have greatly increased. It is urged that the war will give a new opportunity for tackling the problem, and the Jew is called upon to do his part:

> If the Jews seize the opportunity at once to practise an altruistic nationalism, if they not only seek peace, but also, in the Bible phrase, pursue peace, and if they and the Arabs come to an understanding and concord in the land, their power everywhere to work for justice and peace will be incalculably enhanced. If, on the other hand, strife is renewed between the peoples, their chance of resuming that function will be impaired for a generation.

Few Englishmen, we imagine, know even the name of Benjamin Tallmadge, who became head of Washington's Secret Service. Mr. C. S. Hall's *Benjamin Tallmadge* (Columbia and Oxford Presses, 23s. 6d.) tells his story, pushing 50 pp. of notes to the end of the text to the inconvenience of his readers. Tallmadge was the son of a Congregational minister, and at the end of his life was a pillar of Lyman Beecher's church at Litchfield, Conn., interested in revivals, and using the language customarily employed in referring to them. While yet a soldier he began the business career which occupied much of his thoughts, speculating in currency and land, and becoming involved in the Ohio Company. For many years he was in the House of Representatives, generally in a vocal minority. Money-making, military affairs, politics, religion—it would be hard to tell which was his main interest, but his many concerns throw much light on the life of his times.

No cause has had a more devoted exponent than has Roman Catholic Modernism in Miss Maud Petre, and we are glad that she lived to write *Alfred Loisy* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.), a penetrating study of the religious significance of the excommunicated scholar who died in 1940 at the age of 83. Loisy, as Miss Petre shows, was self-centred, impatient of contradiction, and resentful of criticism, and we learn much about his breaches with von Hügel and Duchesne; but he was direct and truthful, and equally impatient of compromise and camouflage. The position of the sincere and scholarly modernist in the Roman Church calls for sympathy, and we are not sure that the position of Loisy is not more to be admired than that of Duchesne, who tried to avoid reference to subjects likely to get him into trouble, or of von Hügel, who temporized and strove to keep within the Church even though it meant severe limitations of his mental freedom. Loisy came to see that Christianity had created its literature, and not been created by it; the N.T. literature was "catechetical and not historical in character"; together with "his repudiation of all artificial myth-making", his treatment of the person of Christ, and his "resolute effort to urge on men the spiritual character of the universe, and their own spiritual needs", this was his great contribution to religious faith. An Appendix contains passages from Loisy's letters.

Readers of Mr. George Bilainkin's *Diary of a Diplomatic Correspondent* will not be surprised that his *Maisky* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) contains a photograph of the author talking to the Ambassador. The sub-title of the book is "Ten Years Ambassador", and readers must not expect to find in it a picture of Maisky the man: they will not learn, *e.g.*, whether he has any children, any hobbies, or, may we say, any religion, but they will learn

that Mr. Bilainkin regards him as "the most successful Ambassador in recent history". M. Maisky himself said he had "learnt to be very patient with the British", and his patience deserved to be rewarded, though it is doubtful whether the British Government's treatment of the Soviet Union deserved the salvation Russian resistance to the Germans wrought for this island and its people. Mr. Bilainkin's book is not so much a biography as a journalist's account of the decade 1932-42: there are slips in names, strange words like "prisonered", sentences that are no sentences (*e.g.*, on p. 380), and a good deal that is irrelevant, such as a page on the abdication of Edward VIII.

Mr. T. Sharper Knowlson's *Put on Your Thinking Cap* (Thorsons, 5s.) can be relied upon to give the reader some stimulating moments. It consists of paragraphs arising from Mr. Knowlson's reading or thinking, often stating a question or presenting a challenge. They are arranged under Personal and Biographical, Psychology, Literature, Philosophy and Ethics, Science, Politics and Government, The Human World, The Inner Life. A little more care would have avoided "E. M. Foster" and "E. Shilleto".

The violence of Dr. Alfred Noyes's attack on "the pseudo-intellectualists", *The Edge of the Abyss* (Murray, 4s. 6d.) will, we fear, recoil on its perpetrator, and hinder his contentions from having a free course. Often, as in his denunciation of Proust, we agree with him, but sometimes he thwacks so wildly that those he wants to convince of the necessity of spiritual and moral standards will simply remove themselves out of range. This is to be regretted, for he really has something important to say.

It is good to find a young poet who does not strive after the unusual, but is willing to see and to sing. There is keen observation of nature and love for nature in Mr. Roland Mathias's *Days Enduring* (Stockwell, 2s. 6d.), as well as an ear for words, and we welcome a little book which is full of promise. EDITOR.

Admirers of the late Charter Piggott will welcome the memorial volume, *William Charter Piggott, 1872-1943* (Independent Press, 5s.). Passages from his sermons, speeches, prayers, hymns, verses and plays are followed by personal tributes by his friends in the churches at Bedford, Whitefields and Streatham, and in the Congregational Union.

The Poisoned Crown, by Mr. Hugh Kingsmill (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 9s.), is an unusual book, not only for its theme and its manner, which includes many stimulating but perhaps rather shallow historical and psychological generalizations, but for its many illustrations of the chief characters described. Its theme is Lord Acton's thesis that "all power corrupts", as exemplified in the careers of Queen Elizabeth, Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon, and Abraham Lincoln. These make a curious quartet, and Mr. Kingsmill does not attempt to make them fit too closely into any preconceived *schema;* more convincing, on the whole, is his introductory essay on "The Genealogy of Hitler", which he traces from Rousseau by way of Napoleon, Byron, Heine, Balzac, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Wells, and Charlie Chaplin. "Collective remedies do not heal the ills produced by collective action".

When, as Master of Trinity, he died in 1677, at the early age of 46 (not 47), Isaac Barrow had already held chairs of Greek, geometry, and mathematics, in the last of which faculties he was considered to be second only to his pupil, Isaac Newton; he is also renowned for his sermons and for his controversial work against papal supremacy. But the life of a scholar, especially if he writes mostly in Latin, is proverbially difficult to write, and it cannot be said that Mr. Percy H. Osmond's *Isaac Barrow: his life and*

times (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) is altogether a success. The titles of the first four chapters, "The Lad of Mettle", "The Scholar-Cavalier", "The Wandering Scholar", and "The Double-Barrelled Professor", sufficiently indicate the book's style, which abounds in such phrases as "poor Barrow *père*", "our Professor", and " 'spill a beakful' (as our American cousins might have said)"; these contrast strangely with the lengthy passages of Barrow's Latinity in translation. Mr. Osmond's knowledge of Barrow's century is evidently considerable; we like Walter Pope's story of the parishioners who were abashed by Baxter's praise of Barrow's preaching, "for though they had a good opinion of their selves, yet they durst not pretend to be equal to Mr. Baxter".

In *Night Thoughts of a Country Landlady* (Batsford, 12s. 6d.) Miss Edith Olivier presents the musings of Miss Emma Nightingale—whose style is remarkably similar to her own—on the effect the war has had on a country town and community, with special attention to evacuees. Miss Nightingale's attitude is one of mildly ironical detachment, and her manner conversational; there is a pleasant air of *insouciance* about the book which is all too rare in these hustling days. The illustrations by Mr. Rex Whistler have the distinction which one expects in a Batsford book.

Mr. F. J. Sheed has written a new translation of *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (Sheed & Ward, 10s. 6d.), which "tries to be in the English people speak now"; its outstanding characteristic appears to be the use of "Thou" only "in passages of straight prayer", and of "You" (with capital) when Augustine "addresses God in narrative or discussion".

Although Congregationalism is not mentioned in Principal A. Dakin's *The Baptist View of the Church and Ministry* (Kingsgate Press, 1s. 6d.), practically everything described in it except believers' baptism might commend itself to a Congregationalist in search of a modern *Primer* of Congregationalism such as the late Dr. Goodrich's was in his day. Local groups might profitably study Dr. Dakin's exposition alongside of Dr. Micklem's and the Rev. W. J. Huxtable's "Forward" books on the same subjects.

The Rev. A. Halfpenny's *Protestant Sacramentalism* (Independent Press, 6d.) may, similarly, be read together with the book by Mr. Eric Hayman to which attention is drawn in the Editorial.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Dr. A. M. Meerloo is a Dutch medical man and psychologist who spent two years in occupied Holland and was able to estimate the effects of Nazi oppression on the minds of his patients and the population generally. His *Total War and the Human Mind* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is a document of particular value because it is the work of a trained observer, and it is, moreover, written with admirable restraint. The book deals with such subjects as mass reactions to German occupation, Hitler's psychological weapons and methods of propaganda, and the psychology of courage and delusion. It concludes with a disturbing chapter on "The Psychological Preparation of the Next War".

It is perhaps a little strange to find a book on military discipline and morale written by a chaplain. The Rev. Norman Copeland, author of *Psychology and the Soldier* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), has been in the Service since 1929 and has studied the application of modern psychology to all aspects of army life both in peace and war. He has no use for the old "sergeant-major" type of discipline. His book is really a study in the art of leadership, and can be recommended to ministers because it contains a good deal of sound pastoral psychology. Unfortunately Mr. Copeland once

or twice conveys the impression (doubtless unintentionally) that the principal function of religion in the army is to produce discipline and bolster morale.

Many a book fails because its author is too ambitious, and this is the fate of the Rev. W. E. Bywater's *The Power of Thought* (Thorsons, 5s.). In just over 120 pages it sets out to examine every aspect of the subject, and the result is as sketchy as might be expected. Nor does the bibliography suggest such a range and depth of reading as would equip the author to tackle such a vast project.

Home and Family Life (S.C.M. Press) is called a pamphlet but contains as much printed matter as is usually sold for five shillings in these days. It is therefore marvellously cheap at a shilling. It is the work of the Department of the British Council of Churches dealing with Social Responsibility. The first section is analytic and examines the economic changes, social trends and current ideas affecting family life. The second is constructive, setting forth the Christian ideal of family life and the action needed to sustain the family in its function. It is one of the completest examinations of the whole question and should be digested by all ministers and social workers.

In *The Seven Locks* (Dakers, 2s. 6d.) Mr. Hanbury Pawle says that the giant Britain, like Samson, has been in danger because of selfishness and sloth. The root trouble is the decline of Church attendance, and people have drifted away because the Church of England will persist in out-of-date services based on the Book of Common Prayer. (This can scarcely have driven people from the Free Churches, but Mr. Pawle never mentions them anyhow.) The only constructive suggestion is that the Church should "modernise" its Services and have "good clergy"—which seems to mean clergy who are not opposed to films in church, and so forth. Then, apparently, youth will flock back to the Church and the Empire will be safe! The book is violently anti-pacifist but shows no appreciation of the position of the *real* pacifist.

The war has forced many people to grapple afresh with the problem of evil. Baron Erik Palmstierna, who was once Sweden's Foreign Minister and for eighteen years Envoy to the Court of St. James, gives us his reflections in *God's Innocence* (Dakers, 2s. 6d.). He believes that God radiates pure goodness and knows nothing of the evil which afflicts the world. His argument does little to remove the difficulties inseparable from dualism and New Testament scholars would find it difficult to accept his interpretation of the Gospels, but no one can mistake the sincerity of the writer's longing to find a solution which does not seem to impugn the goodness and the love of God.

L. J. TIZARD.

The Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins's *Prayer and the Service of God* (Faber, 5s.) will be helpful to those who are setting out in the prayer life; it will give them guidance where this is so often needed, in many of the questions and practical difficulties that beset prayer, and in the quickening of the devotional spirit. There is much in it that is admirable in thought and intention, but the value of the book would be increased if it were less involved in style and easier to read.

Canon Roger Lloyd's *The Inspiration of God* (Centenary Press, 5s.) is an appeal to us to recover something of the lost gift of a Divine inspiration; and this cannot be done by way of individual devotion alone, but must be the result of thought and meditation in "community"; in other words, of a renewed spirit within the Church both of worship and all that worship implies. In no other way can the hard questions of the future find any lasting solution. Without following Canon Lloyd in all he says of the social

problems which are in front, or in the exact place he gives the Church, one can go a long way with him. He is far-seeing, and has something to say that is urgent and spiritually sane. This is a very challenging book.

Be Ye Perfect, by Dr. William Butterfield (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.); *The Beginnings of Goodness*, by Columba Cary-Elwes, Monk of Ampleforth (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.); *Russian Letters of Direction*, by Macarius, Starets of Optino, selection, translation and foreword by Julia de Beausobre (Dacre Press, 5s.). These three books are all of them practical guides to the religious life. The first two are Roman Catholic and follow the general lines of Roman pastoral theology. The third is very interesting as an illustration of the spiritual wealth and understanding stored up in the Russian Orthodox Church. Macarius, the gentle scholar, a selection from whose letters the book contains, was a Starets, or spiritual director, chiefly of educated men and women. The letters are "often pierced by rays of remarkably lucid thought and flashes of astonishing insight". As one reads this selection the feeling grows that East and West are not so utterly divided.

A. T. S. JAMES.

Two books for which Youth Club Leaders will be grateful are Mr. Geoffrey Hoyland's *The Great Outlaw* (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.) and Mr. S. G. Hedges's *Youth Club Epilogues* (Methuen, 4s. 6d.). Mr. Hoyland's ability to secure and retain the interest of youth, revealed earlier in his *Sermons in Shorts*, enables him here to picture Jesus, as He walked about the lanes of Galilee and the streets of Jerusalem, in a way that should fascinate boys—and older people too. He notices "an extraordinary parallel between the Outlaw of Sherwood and the founder of Christianity". His retelling of the story is unconventional but not artificial, and is at once satisfying and challenging. Mr. Hedges is concerned with the problem of worship in Youth Clubs, and has produced a much-needed compilation of suitable material. His talks and anecdotes are varied in topic, fresh and virile, and cover the main events in the life of Christian Youth Clubs, while the prayers are culled from many sources from St. Augustine to Mr. M. L. Jacks. There are good suggestions for Bible Reading and for Christian Youth Rituals.

Basic Christianity, by Dr. H. D. A. Major (Blackwell, 3s. 6d.), contains the substance of a series of addresses from the standpoint of Liberal Modernism on the question how best to meet the need for a world religion today. Dr. Major defines Basic Christianity as the religion of Jesus Himself in conduct and thought.

Mr. John Hadham—to use the pen-name of Dr. James Parkes—has followed up *Good God* and *Between God and Man* with another Penguin Special, *God and Human Progress* (1s.). He stresses the need for an active faith, to be expressed in social and economic matters, if men are to be won readily and any radical political reform is to become possible. The book maintains the author's reputation for a combination of solid and objective thought with popular and forthright presentation.

Three Livingstone Press publications are Miss Joyce Reason's *A Pageant of Ships* (8d.), a celebration of the Centenary of the John Williams Line; *Our John Williams* (9d.), several shorter items on the same theme; and *The Eagle Omnibus, No. 1* (2s. 6d.), in which the first six Eagle Books are reprinted. Vol. 3 of the Junior Lessons in the "Teachers' Guide Series", *Heroes of the Call and Quest* (Religious Education Press, 5s. & 4s. 6d.), contains lessons on Peter, Pioneers of the Early Church, Modern Missionaries, Old Testament Figures from Samuel to Jeroboam, and Prayer.

K. G. OGILVIE.

Adult education in this country is likely to develop in all sorts of new directions during the next twenty years. That is why *Education in Democracy*, by Messrs. C. Moller and K. Watson (Faber, 5s.), is a book to read now. It is a well-written, reliable, and exciting account of the Folk High Schools of Denmark, from which can be learned what has been done in that country to make life for the worker, and especially the agricultural worker, a wider and more purposive thing.

A Child's Personal Religion, by Mr. Noël Nicholl (Challenge Press, 3s. 6d.), is wise, simple, and practical. Its understanding of education is broad and enlightened, and in spite of a slightly Anglican bias it can be warmly commended to Free Church parents with young children.

W. R. NIBLETT.

Miss Enid Blyton's *Tales from the Bible* (Methuen, 6s.) will be welcomed by both parents and teachers of young children. Miss Blyton has chosen the stories from the Old Testament which she thinks hold the greatest appeal for children. They are written in a simple style which children will easily follow for themselves.

In *The Second Form at St. Clare's* (Methuen, 5s.) Miss Blyton is less successful. Reality is essential for a good school story, and this seems to be lacking. Perhaps this is due to the fact that girls of fourteen and fifteen are too old for average first and second forms. MARGARET PEEL.

A psychological approach to religion is represented in the 1944 Swarthmore Lecture, *Man, Society and Religion*, by Dr. W. Russell Brain (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.). The relation of altruism and love, the meaning of social security, and the Quaker method of group-worship are among the subjects discussed. Dr. Brain commends Quaker education as producing a combination of tenderness with toughness, and says, "To become a Friend is a unique experience: it is to enter a system of human relationships which has none of the defensive barriers which in ordinary life take so long to overcome".

The 1944 Taylorian lecture was delivered by Professor P. S. Gerbrandy, with the title *National and International Stability* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.). The Prime Minister of the Netherlands here analyses the thought of "the representatives *par excellence* of the Netherlands contribution to political law and to the law of nations", *viz.*, Althusius, Grotius, and Van Vollenhoven, with special attention to Althusius (?1557-1638); he contrasts the ethical autonomy of man inculcated by German idealistic philosophy with the Christian heteronomy of these Dutch thinkers.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

Three books in the Home University Library (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d. each) have appeared in new editions: Mr. G. H. Mair's excellent *English Literature: Modern—1450-1939*, with a lively epilogue by Mr. A. C. Ward, for the years 1914-1939; the late Canon E. W. Watson's *The Church of England;* and Professor Basil Williams's *The British Empire*, with a postscript entitled "The Empire At War Again". The Friends' Home Service Committee have reprinted Mr. T. R. Kelly's *Reality of the Spiritual World: A Quaker View*, which originally appeared as Pendle Hill Pamphlet No. 21. Mr. P. A. Scholes's *The Listener's History of Music* is now in its 6th edition. Vol. I, recently issued (Oxford Press), is 6s. It is good to hear that

the Rev. Francis Wrigley's *The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Research* has gone to yet another edition, its fourth (Indep. Press, 6s.). Another useful work of a different kind to see a new edition is Dr. Anne H. McAllister's *A Year's Course in Speech Training*, the first edition of which appeared in 1938 (Univ. of London Press, 6s.). Father A. Bonnar's *The Catholic Doctor* (Burns, 7s. 6d.) is the third and revised edition of a book first published in 1937. It is perhaps significant that a chapter on "Freudian Dogma" has been replaced by one on "Pain and Suffering".

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

What Manner of Man is This? (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.) contains Dr. W. R. Maltby's addresses broadcast in Holy Week. Prof. John Laird's *The Temper of British Ideals* and Prof. A. B. Browning's *British Political Institutions* in Craig & Wilson's "The British Way" series (1s. each) are well worth reading.

ALSO RECEIVED.

W. J. McEldowney. *The Second Mile.* Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d. Fifteen talks to girls and boys.

Doris W. Street. *Parents' Associations.* N.S.S.U. 4d. A useful account of how they may be formed and what they can do.

"G. L. Brand". *A Layman's View of St. Paul.* Stockwell.

C. E. B. Neate. *A Priest in the Making.* Faith Press. 1s. 6d.

G. S. Burne, S.J. *Looking for Charity?* Burns, Oates. 1s.

W. E. Blackburn. *The Sun is Rising.* Avery (Aberdeen). 3s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April). After a consideration of "The Christian Church: Retrospect and Prospect" by Dr. Maldwyn Edwards, the Rev. W. L. Hannam asks "Does God Intervene?", the Rev. Richard Pyke writes admiringly of Bishop Westcott, and the Rev. Frederick Greeves analyses "The Preacher's Vocabulary". The present tension in theology is surveyed by Dr. W. F. Howard, and Dr. Ryder Smith reviews Volume II of Professor Reinhold Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures. Other articles include studies of Sherlock Holmes, Flaubert and Conrad.

The Hibbert Journal (April). In "The Living and Speaking God", the Rev. R. G. Smith studies Hamann's doctrine of "the Word"; Dr. L. R. Wheeler comments at length on Mr. H. G. Wells's "Memorandum on Biological Survival" in the last issue; Father Edward Quinn presents "The Natural and the Supernatural" from the Roman Catholic point of view, with special reference to St. Thomas; the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas criticizes current plans for religious education under the caption of "Compulsory Christianity"; Dr. G. G. Coulton writes on "Antisemitism: a chapter in world history". Other articles are on "Telepathy in the light of Whitehead's philosophy"; Tolstoy's answer to the question "Who makes History?"; and Blanco White.

The Church Quarterly Review (April-June). The Editor discusses the relation between "Creed and Gospel", Mr. Lennox Russell considers the Archbishops' plans for social reform in "Coercion or Voluntarism", Miss Kathleen Edwards writes with erudition on "Bishops and Learning in the Reign of Edward II", Dr. H. H. Kramm describes the "Organization and Constitution of the German Protestant Churches".

The Expository Times (April-May). In the new "New Order" series the Bishop of Truro writes on "The New Approach to Theology", which he says "will naturally begin with a study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit", and Mr. H. D. Lewis on "Personality and the New Order". Principal Hywel Hughes discusses contemporary "Either . . . Or Theology", and finds it "opposed to the essential spirit and ideal of Christianity".

The International Review of Missions (April). Dr. P. D. Devanandan asks "Whither Theology in Christian India?", Mr. J. Merle Davis discusses "The Problem of Aid to the Younger Churches", with special reference to a trained ministry and self-support, Dr. K. S. Latourette describes "the bearing of pre-war Christian groups in Asia on post-war planning", the Rev. D. M. Paton tells of "Christian Work in Chinese Government Universities", Mr. S. A. Morrison considers what Christianity has to say on the problem of minorities.

The Review and Expositor (January). W. W. Barnes explains "Why the Southern Baptist Convention was formed". E. A. Macdowell outlines "The Gospel of Love for our Day", J. T. Stallings writes of "The Fatherly Nature of God", S. L. Morgan considers "The Preacher's Public Prayer".

The Review of Religion (March). Professor Reinhold Niebuhr's second volume of Gifford Lectures receives attention here also, from Professor F. de W. Bolman, Jr.; Professor R. E. Fitch writes on "Crisis and Continuity in History", and J. L. Blau on "The Maryland 'Jew Bill': A Footnote to Thomas Jefferson's Work for Freedom of Religion".

The Yale Review (Winter). Miss Helen Mears's "The Japanese Emperor" and Capt. H. A. DeWeerd's "Germany's Strategic Position" are perhaps the best articles, though Mr. Hoffman Philip's "Abyssinian Memories" are racy, and Prof. Alvin Johnson's "Race in the World to Come" is important. We may agree with the conclusion of Prof. A. Guérard's "Is England in Europe", but the writer has little knowledge of England. There are some good reviews.

The Yale Review (Spring). "What we didn't know hurt us a lot", by Professor Carl Becker; "The Constitution v. the Peace", by Mr. Henry Hazlitt; "Behind the Japanese Lines", by Major Bernard Fergusson; "Using our Marine Resources", by Mr. Daniel Merriman; "The New Order in Occupied China", by Mr. E. H. Clayton; "Britain's New Colonial Policy", by Mr. R. S. Kain; "The Island Road to Tokyo", by Mr. Willard Price. These are only the main articles in a full number.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE FORTY AND FIVE OR THE NINETY AND NINE.

SIR,—In 1919 or maybe 1920, I heard Mr. Plowright preach in Highbury Quadrant Chapel on the incident of the importunate friend, with special reference to "I have nothing to set before him". So impressed was I that I wrote him partly to thank him and partly to seek further help. Very graciously he replied, thanking me for my appreciation—but the further help was not forthcoming. Judging from his answer to my article in your last issue, he has not travelled far in the meantime. And I am quite sure that the journey is really necessary.

"It is because we Christians are so little different from non-Christians that the Kingdom tarries" and "Is it not disturbingly true that dynamic force is lacking today?"—these were the really important points of my criticism, and I wish he had concerned himself with them instead of belabouring me with such undisguised relish on relatively unimportant matters.

Yours very faithfully,

A. W. EDWARDS.

London, W.C.1. 14th February, 1944.